

of hydroelectric power shall be performed by the Federal Power Commission.

Section 14 provides protection for all existing contracts.

Section 15 authorizes appropriation to carry into effect the provisions of the law.

As the author of the bill, I make the following claims:

First. We will avoid the expense of building stand-by steam plants; such expense estimated to be as much as \$635,-076,000.

Second. We will avoid the expense of building transmission and distributing lines which might cost more than the steam stand-by plants.

Third. We will avoid the expense of a vast personnel which would be necessary to supervise and manage the operation of the plants and offices in connection with the generation and distribution of such hydroelectric power.

Fourth. We will avoid the possible loss of vast sums in Federal income taxes in the sum of \$423,000,000 in 1945.

Fifth. The States, counties, cities, and local districts will avoid the possible loss of electric-utility taxes in the sum of \$239,000,000 in 1945.

In addition to the vast savings to the Treasury and the taxpayers the bill will bring to the Treasury and to the people vast sums as follows:

First. The Federal Treasury will receive the revenue derived from the sales of the power at the dams.

Second. The Treasury will continue to receive the income taxes from the electric utilities which amount to many hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

Third. The stockholders and bond holders will continue to receive dividends and interest from their investments and they in turn will continue to pay income taxes on such income to the Federal Treasury.

Fourth. The consumers will secure electric energy at the lowest possible cost consistent with sound and efficient management—all under the supervision of the Federal Power Commission.

I contend that the bill will stimulate and expand the production of hydroelectric energy by making available more funds for the development of reclamation and flood-control projects.

The funds saved from expenditures on stand-by steam plants, transmission and distributing lines, and personnel will be available for the construction of such projects.

The enactment of the bill into a law will coordinate and concentrate the public power activities of the Government into one Federal agency—the Federal Power Commission now already in existence. This coordination of Government agencies will likewise save the Treasury vast sums of money annually.

To the extent that the program suggested saves expenditures and, in addition, provides additional funds and revenues to the Treasury the bill will assist in balancing the budget and in meeting the costs of the Federal Government.

Summarizing and in conclusion, I contend that the bill, when enacted into

law, will do two very unusual things—it will both save money and make money for the Federal, State, city, county, and district treasuries.

It will save money for the Federal Treasury by not incurring the enormous expenses of constructing stand-by steam plants, of transmission and distributing lines and the personnel necessary to supervise and manage such utilities.

The bill will save money for the State, city, county, and district treasuries by preserving for them the taxes they are collecting at the present time.

The bill will make money for the Federal Treasury through the sale of electric energy at the point of manufacture.

The bill will make money for State, city, county, and district treasuries through savings in electric bills and services.

It is my contention that under the provisions of the bill the public interest will be served and at the same time the consumers will secure electric energy and services at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles and efficient management.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 24, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 21 (legislative day of February 19), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edwin F. Stanton, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Siam.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 21 (legislative day of February 19), 1947:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Garrison Norton to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 2 AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

David M. Maynard
Franklin W. Wolf

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3, CONSUL, AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Claude Courand

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Henry C. Ramsey
Anthony Clinton Swezey
Horace G. Torbert, Jr.

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Taylor G. Belcher Benjamin J. Ruyle
John G. Gossett Miss Mary E. Volz
Royce L. Lowry

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of our Lord and Master, harken unto our prayer; we beseech Thee that it may climb to the highest courts of heaven, to Him who wore our human flesh and made Thy love available to all. Separate us from the things that divide us, from the forgetfulness of the things we should remember, and from everything that obscures Thy holy purpose.

Dear Lord, consecrate the homes of our land and cleanse our politics; undismayed, help us to face our problems with truth and honor, that the Congress may be a constant inspiration to all ranks of our citizens. O give us wisdom to discern and courage to do whatever is needful. Grant that the Members may work and plan together in mutual trust, with integrity of character and devotion of purpose. Help us to find our joy in doing Thy will, engendering the spirit of true patriotism, from the chiefest to the humblest. Looking back at the close of these hours, may we feel, with pardonable pride, the sense of Thy approval. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include four resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] be given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of the program of the first national meeting of the Advisory Committee of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held next week in Philadelphia, to which all Members of Congress are invited.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN COMMITMENTS

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, last night I determined to ask some of the people who are going to pay the bill what they thought of the President's plan of a global crusade against communism. Pointing to a headline in last night's paper, which I hold before me, which says, "Six hundred million dollars asked for aid to Korea," I asked the waitress who served me dinner what she thought about it, since we were already asked to give \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey. She said, "I think they are taking us for suckers. I think that after we have spent the money the boys will be sent after it to die again."

Mr. Speaker, I intend to ask the people, the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker, if I can find one, to find their answers, and, with your permission and with the permission of the Members of the House, I am going to bring back to you 1-minute reports of their answers. They ought to be interesting.

"SORRY, IT'S A SECRET"

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time someone told the State Department that they are no longer dealing with a rubber-stamp Congress. In the elections of last November 5, the American people voted an end to—among other things—the "era of the blank check."

Yesterday the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House voted out a bill proposing to grant \$350,000,000 in food and other aid for devastated nations abroad. It has come to my attention that during the testimony on this bill, the so-called State Department experts refused to give the American people a break-down of where this money is going. In other words, it is the same old New Deal doctrine that the people are too dumb to understand.

I have tried to find out how much of this money is going to Poland, how much to Hungary, to Italy, how much to the other countries. The only answer I have been given, the only answer the American people have gotten from our State Department is "Sorry, it's a secret."

We have gotten into too much trouble already because of these secret deals. I am all in favor, Mr. Speaker, of feeding starving people, but what is so secret about it? It was not a secret when UNRRA did it.

I say, let the American taxpayers in on a few of these secrets. It is their money these free spenders are distributing; they are paying the bills.

GREETINGS FROM GEORGIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in Washington the calendar has decreed that spring begins today. In the Fifth District of Georgia, Mother Nature

herself long ago issued that decree, and there the earth is beautiful with daffodils, blue hyacinths, yellow jasmine, and other fragrant and colorful flowers.

Yesterday the De Kalb County Chamber of Commerce sent a truckload of flowers to Washington in compliment to the Nation's lawmakers. They were gathered by Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and school children, women's clubs and civic clubs, and this morning 12 charming girls from the Fifth District have placed a bouquet in each Senator's office, and have left a quantity for the Representatives' cloak rooms and dining rooms. You are invited to take them with the compliments of De Kalb County, educational center, county of industry and agriculture, home of Stone Mountain, famous dogwood blossoms, and luscious Georgia peaches.

We expect to share with you here from time to time, and we offer to all our visitors, such examples of Nature's bounty as peaches in May, watermelons in August, apples in September, cane sirup in October, roses in December, and southern hospitality the year around.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CARSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, may I say to my friend from Kansas, who cannot get the information he wants from the State Department, that I want to give him some information that we all get every day from the Treasury Department. I want to show you that on the 18th of March we were \$258,934,078,366.21 in the red. Where will you get all that money? We have been in the red so long that this Treasury statement, instead of being published in black, ought to be published in red every day, and it should have been published that way for the last 15 years with the squandering and spending of the New Deal. But we are getting information now, and I think that with this Republican Congress we are going to do something about this red sheet. We will make it black or bust. We are going to cut down expenses in this country in a way that nobody ever dreamed of, unnecessary expenses, but if we cut down expenses here for things the American people want, you have to be mighty careful in what you do in spending and giving money to foreign countries. It is serious and critical. That is going to be a very ticklish thing, and you should think about it very sincerely before you vote.

We will cut down spending; we will cut down the debt; we will cut down on your taxes. However, a Government not good

enough to support by taxation is not fit to exist. I am not talking of exorbitant taxes like the 14 new tax bills of the last 12 years. We must pay our bills and cut down on our national debt.

A people willing that its Government borrow and borrow and borrow just lacks common sense.

Be careful of your spending are the wisest words I can give you now. Open your eyes and economize.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence for 2 days, on account of official business, be granted to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HARTLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GOLD PURCHASING

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in view of the responsibility of Congress to have before it the fullest information bearing upon the President's recent message to Congress and on the implication of H. R. 2616, it is desirable to know whether this country is pursuing consistent policies.

One of our policies, which is of direct help to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on economic lines, is the United States official policy of purchasing gold from every source at \$35 an ounce.

Before the recent war this policy was suspended in the case of the Axis, because it was pursuing political and economic policies which the administration considered injurious to this country. The question now is: Are we similarly pursuing in the matter of gold buying a policy in conflict with that which the President has just recommended to the Congress? To obtain the administration's views on this important matter I have written the Secretary of the Treasury for information.

ALCOHOL RUBBER INDUSTRY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a bill that I am introducing today. Its purpose is to perpetuate our wartime-created alcohol rubber industry and thereby improve the defense of our country. In addition to that, I feel that this proposal can be made to be very beneficial to the farmers of America and can be made to fit in with a sound and constructive program for agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, my proposal is that a manufacturers' excise tax be placed upon all rubber, foreign and domestic, except such rubber as is manufactured or produced in the United States from butadiene, which is produced from grain alcohol.

If natural rubber is selling on the world market for about 15 cents per pound, it is impossible for an American manufacturer to buy high-priced corn, wheat, potatoes, and the countless other products of the farm, turn them into alcohol, and then into rubber, and end up by not having this synthetic rubber cost more than the natural rubber or more than rubber made from petroleum. Consequently, the only way that an alcohol rubber industry can be built up is by giving it certain protection.

At the present time, the plants that made alcohol and rubber during the war are still owned by the Government. I would like to create a situation favorable toward this industry so American businessmen would be induced to buy these plants and operate them. This will make a market for millions and millions of bushels and pounds of surplus crops as well as create a new industry in the United States that will provide employment for many.

I propose this tax advantage not to help any particular businessman or investor, but as part of an agricultural program and as a very essential factor in our defense.

The amount of the tax is something that Congress will have to work out. If, through the Commodity Credit Corporation or other Government agency, these alcohol plants can buy potatoes that might be dumped, soft corn, or other surpluses, at a nominal price, the tax can be effective and still not be very high. If, on the other hand, these plants are to buy ordinary farm products at the supported price, the tax must be higher.

I do feel that it offers a program that is worth trying.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each an editorial.

Mr. NODAR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by the national commander of the Catholic War Veterans on communism.

Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a clipping from the New York Times.

COPPER PRODUCTION

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a good deal lately about monopolies. The Federal Trade Commission has just released a report which accuses the large copper companies of this country of monopolizing the production of copper. I should like to point out that copper deposits, as is true with most ore bodies, vary in their size, richness, physical conformations, and hence in cost of operation. It happens, then, when the price of copper drops our small and margined high-cost mines are squeezed out of production not, it may be noted, by deliberate intent but due to the accidental economics of supply, demand, and price.

Before the last war only a handful of copper mines could operate due to low metal prices. During the war the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc created an economic atmosphere in which marginal mines could live and hundreds of them sprang up into operation. At present, high prices in combination with premiums are keeping these mines alive. The premium-price plan expires June 30, 1947. Prices eventually will fall—and they generally come down faster than they went up. It is inevitable that without the stabilizing influence of the plan, small and marginal mines gradually will be forced to close until only the few low-cost mines will again be left. The cry of monopoly will then be heard with renewed strength.

I should like to call to the attention of the House the established fact that the premium-price plan for copper, lead, and zinc is the best antimonopoly device we yet have seen as far as the mining industry goes. Under it small and marginal mines can thrive, produce metal for necessary industrial and war stock-pile needs and, with good fortune, perhaps grow into large mines.

For the afore-mentioned reasons I have long felt that the continuation of a premium plan in some form is essential. I introduced, early in the session, H. R. 1284 to establish a National Resources Division to administer such a plan. It has received a good deal of favorable comment.

Bills looking toward the same end have been introduced by Mr. ALLEN of Illinois; Mr. HILL, of Colorado; Mr. MEYER, of Kansas; and Mr. RUSSELL, of Nevada. I understand the bill, H. R. 2455, by my friend the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL] may be favorably reported from Public Lands. I sincerely hope so. The mining industry wants and needs this legislation. I intend to support H. R. 2455 vigorously and I trust it will have the favorable consideration of the Members when it comes to the floor for a vote.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article from this morning's

Washington Post, and in the other the recommendations of the National Committee on Housing concerning veterans' housing.

NATURAL GAS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON] called the attention of the House to the introduction of several bills having to do with the study of our gas supply and the use of natural gas. I sincerely trust the fact that the appropriate committee is entering into a study of this important subject will serve as notice to the Federal Power Commission to go slow in the granting of any license to any company acquiring the Big or Little Inch pipe lines. The use of these lines for distribution of gas to the Atlantic seaboard will destroy one of the basic industries of America, and it seems to me that before any license is issued the committee should make a very thorough study of the entire subject.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an article from the Montgomery Advertiser.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an article from the Christian Science Monitor and in the other to include an editorial from the Telegram News of Lynn, Mass.

TRAIN MEN TO WIN THE PEACE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, as Americans, we have been capable of superhuman efforts in the waging of war. But when it comes to peace, we have gone to the other extreme. Things will take care of themselves, we say, and follow a policy of drift which inevitably leads to another war.

Our people have sensed the fact that the American diplomatic service is not represented by men of the highest professional skill. They have the fatalistic feeling that the victories which our fighting men have won will be lost by our amateur diplomats.

Foreigners resent American representatives who are forever bragging about our Nation's accomplishments and who show no respect for the lands in which they are guests. It is this failure to try and understand the other nation's viewpoints which has caused us to make so many diplomatic blunders in the past.

We need to establish a United States Foreign Service Academy which will educate men for the highest task of all: That of preserving the peace.

In this atomic age, we cannot play at diplomacy. We have got to have the best of trained men to represent us abroad.

To accomplish this, I believe that we should pass this bill to establish in or near the District of Columbia a United States Foreign Service Academy.

Under the direction of the State Department, it shall train carefully selected applicants in the history, culture, customs, folklore, and languages of the nations in which the diplomatic cadets may elect to serve, and provide for field studies in such nations.

Upon satisfactory completion of the course, the cadets shall be granted the degree of bachelor of arts and shall be given preference in the appointment of permanent officers in the Foreign Service of the United States.

This is the logical way to properly train career men for these posts of high responsibility.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article from the Army and Navy Journal.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution adopted by the Rhode Island General Assembly in support of President Truman's position regarding conditions in Greece.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

ON-THE-JOB-TRAINING PROGRAM

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I received the following letter from Lowell, Mass.:

LOWELL, MASS., March 13, 1947.

The Honorable Mrs. ROGERS.

DEAR MADAM: What became of the legislation proposed to correct the inequalities in the GI bill of rights pertaining to the on-the-job-training program. There was a good deal of talk about raising the monthly limit of \$200 and even increasing the monthly allowance.

I hope something is done about it in the near future; if not, I am afraid I and a few more like me will be forced to give up our training program for lack of a living wage.

Thanking you for past considerations, I remain,

Mr. Speaker, I think there was a great misunderstanding in the House and throughout the country generally when the Committee on Veterans' Affairs raised the ceilings for on-the-job training. The public, and I believe many of the Members, feel that the Government will pay more subsistence allowance under H. R. 246, which was reported unanimously from our committee and is now upon the calendars of the House. That is not the case. No matter what the ceiling is, the Government would not increase the amount un-

der this bill, but would pay no more than the subsistence allowance of \$65 for a single veteran and \$90 for a married veteran, as is being done at the present time.

In the first GI bill, enacted in 1944, there were no ceilings on wages. However, later amendments to the law permitted a veteran to earn only \$110 above the amount paid him in subsistence allowance. Thousands of veterans could not qualify for the allowance under these restrictions, and were dropped from the payment rolls of the Veterans' Administration. Now, in raising the ceilings you are but giving back to these veterans a part of what you took away from them by legislative action last year, and which passed the House under a great misunderstanding.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES ACT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplementary report on the bill H. R. 1350.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] be granted leave of absence for today, Monday, and Tuesday, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, in one to include a portion of a press release by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, and in the other a telegram from the Ukrainian American Relief Committee.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement which carries a few quotations which he is sending to people in his district.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not, but we are interested to know just as much of the program for next week as the gentleman can announce at this time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, my information is that the Committee on Appropriations expects to report the appro-

priation bill on Labor and Federal Security in time for its consideration on Monday next. If it is so reported, general debate on the bill will be held on Monday and the bill will be read on Tuesday. If the consideration of that bill is completed sufficiently early on Tuesday, we propose to call up House Resolution 151, which is a resolution from the Rules Committee to reestablish the committee to investigate all matters pertaining to the replacement and conservation of wildlife.

On Wednesday and Thursday we hope to have ready for consideration the tax bill, as I announced yesterday. It is our plan to conclude debate on the bill on Thursday and vote on the bill Thursday evening.

Friday is undetermined. Unless something should develop that would require attention on that date, we might adjourn from Thursday until the following Monday.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT DEBT AND INCOME

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania who read us figures on the record-breaking war debt that the United States Government must carry.

I only hope the gentleman is concerned with both sides of the fiscal program, namely, the income of the Government as well as the outgo. It is amazing to me that in the proposed Knutson tax reduction plan that is coming before us next week reducing income taxes of the very rich by 20 percent, the only way the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee could find to justify that bill—or perhaps deodorize it—was to cut another \$350,000,000 out of the Government's revenue. This 350 million is a "tip" given to the lower-income groups to give the Knutson plan a sugar-coating.

If that is the majority party's idea of sound fiscal responsibility, to ignore the necessary income of the Government at a time when we have an all-time high war debt, exceeding any debt that has ever been carried by any government on the face of this globe, then I do not know the meaning of financial responsibility. I believe this Nation wants debt reduction before tax reduction is considered.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], who just addressed the House, makes me think of a squalling, bawling, suckling calf being separated from its mother. You take these New Dealers away from the public pay roll, get their feet and heads out of the trough where they have been feeding for the last 15 years at the taxpayers' expense, and hear them squall. The only philosophy they know is that of spending—borrowing money, because, as they say, "we owe it to ourselves"—then tax and spend more and more with the hope that they may be reelected. That is their philosophy. If we are foolish enough to go along with that theory and let them keep on spending down at the other end of the Avenue so they can stay in office, then certainly we are dumb. I do not fall for that one. If we cut off these expenses, the budget will balance itself and the spenders may soon be out.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (H. DOC. NO. 177)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith for your consideration a suggested joint resolution providing for United States membership and participation in the World Health Organization. I also am enclosing a memorandum from the Secretary of State with reference to United States membership in the World Health Organization.

I have been impressed by the spirit of international good will and community of purpose which have characterized the development of the constitution of this Organization. I am sure that it will make a substantial contribution to the improvement of world health conditions through the years.

In view of the significance and urgency of international health problems, I consider it important that the United States join the World Health Organization as soon as possible. Therefore, I hope that the suggested joint resolution may have the early consideration of Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 21, 1947.

[Enclosures: 1. Joint resolution; 2. Memorandum from Secretary of State.]
TERM OF OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Speaker to lay before the House for immediate consideration House Joint Resolution 27, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President, with Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out all after "SECTION 1." over to and including "term." in line 4, page 2, and insert "No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of the President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this bill with the Senate amendment was returned to the House on March 13. It was taken informally before the full Committee on the Judiciary, and I am instructed by that committee to call the resolution up at this time for the purpose of agreeing to the Senate amendment. I have followed precedent and cleared through the majority leader and the minority leader.

I therefore move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MICHENER moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes after he has completed his statement?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; if the gentleman desires to be heard.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this matter was thoroughly discussed in the House when House Joint Resolution 27 was before us for consideration. Adequate study was given by the Senate committee to the House bill and, with amendments, it was reported to the floor of the Senate where extensive debate was indulged in. After that debate the Senate amendment, now contained in the bill, was adopted.

What the Senate amendment does is best explained by reading the amendment:

No person shall be elected to the office of President more than twice.

That is clear, two terms of 4 years each.

And no person who has held the office of President or acted as President for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once.

That is the material change. There is a change in language and a change in context. Under the Senate amendment it is possible for a President to serve two full terms, to be elected twice, regard-

less of any other service which he might have had as President, provided he shall only be elected once if he has served more than 2 years of another or a third term. The possibility therefore is that a President may conceivably, under this amendment, serve not to exceed 10 years.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. That would not apply to the present President, Mr. Truman, if he were reelected, would it?

Mr. MICHENER. No; I can answer that it does not apply to the present occupant of the White House, who is serving as President by virtue of having been elected as Vice President and the death of the President. It would in no way affect the present occupant of the office.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, if President Truman were reelected in 1948 and again in 1952, he could serve out those terms.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. What the gentleman has stated is correct, but not insofar as the language he has just read is concerned. The following language is designed to meet the situation described by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MICHENER. As to the present incumbent of the office, yes.

Mr. WALTER. As to the present incumbent of the office.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is quite correct. I intended to read all the language in the amendment. I may say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is a very able member of the Judiciary Committee and, together with the committee, gave very close attention to this amendment since it was promulgated by the Senate.

Personally, I prefer—and I think most if not all members of the House Judiciary Committee prefer—the language adopted by the House. To me that language is more concise and understandable. There are no useless words. It is not pregnant with questions.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. As one Member who voted for the resolution when it passed the House, I wish to say to the gentleman from Michigan that I prefer the language of the Senate amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Was not this language inserted in the Senate bill in order to avoid the possibility of anyone's pointing their finger at the present occupant of the White House?

Mr. MICHENER. That was the purpose, and it was stated in debate in the Senate that this was not an action in personam.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CAMP. I think I misunderstood the gentleman's statement a moment ago. Is it not possible—not speaking of the present occupant of the office—for some President to serve 10 years?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I thought I so stated. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CAMP. I think the gentleman said eight. I just wanted it corrected.

Mr. MICHENER. If I did, I was wrong; two whole terms and not to exceed two additional years or 10 years.

Mr. CAMP. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. It would be conceivable that a President might serve 10 years. That could happen. I believe when we legislate, we should always think of the possibilities and not the probabilities. The probabilities are that this amendment of the Senate would provide two terms of 4 years each for any one man, with the possibility just alluded to. The important thing is a definite limitation of terms.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am sorry, I did not hear all of the gentleman's discussion and he may have answered this. As I understand, under the proposed amendment, as far as the present incumbent of the Presidency is concerned, he will be entitled to be a candidate to the Presidency two full terms.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It would not apply in the future to any other Vice President who succeeds to the presidency.

Mr. MICHENER. In the future, my understanding is that but two terms of 4 years each are contemplated. This language in the Senate amendment is rather complicated but it is the considered conclusion of the Senate.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Let us see about that now. The gentleman says 10 years. Suppose a President and Vice President are elected for 4 years, and the President should die within 1 year. If that Vice President would come in and serve 3 years as President, then would he be entitled to two terms after that?

Mr. MICHENER. No.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Then why is a special exception made to this one incumbent, and if so, how then in the future could anybody be elected for more than two terms?

Mr. MICHENER. The first part of the amendment says:

No person shall be elected to the office of President more than twice—

And—

No person who has held the office of President or acted as President for more than 2 years of the term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of the President more than once.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is very clear then. What that means is this: If a man ascends to the Presidency from the Vice Presidency, and if he served more than 2 years, then he cannot qualify to be a candidate twice for the Presidency.

Mr. MICHENER. No; he cannot qualify twice.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Well, let us take my case. Suppose a man is elected President and another is elected Vice President, and the President dies within a month, and the Vice President succeeds him. Now, that Vice President cannot be elected but once, because he served more than 2 years in that term.

Mr. MICHENER. That is correct, and that is the way it is intended to be.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Here is what the amendment means then. Any man who succeeds to the office after the President has served 2 years, in other words, succeeds so that he will serve less than 2 years, can be a candidate twice, but if he ascends to the Presidency within 2 years after he has been made Vice President he cannot be a candidate for the Presidency but once.

Mr. MICHENER. I said in the beginning that I considered this language more complicated than the House language. If the gentleman will read the debates on this matter in the Senate he will see that there was a difference of opinion. The gentleman's interpretation is correct. Of course, this limitation of one term would apply to any other person, like the Secretary of State, who executed the office of President more than 2 years after the beginning of anyone else's 4-year term.

If the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 27 is concurred in at this time, that ends the consideration of the resolution by the Congress. Two-thirds of the House and the Senate having voted in favor of the resolution, it then goes to the legislatures of the several States for ratification or rejection.

Usually legislation passing the House and the Senate contains some elements of compromise. That is natural because the 531 Members of the Congress do not always think exactly alike, especially when details are involved. So it is in the case before us. More than two-thirds of each House is agreed that the people should be permitted to vote on limiting the term which a President of the United States may serve. There is difference among those two-thirds as to the length of that term. There is difference as to the best language to be used in a constitutional amendment. Those differences have not been composed in precise accordance with the views of any individual in the Congress. There is some language I would like to change. I could select a term of limitation more agreeable to me than that contained in the resolution. However, this is the composite view of the people's representatives in Congress, and I hope that my motion will prevail, that this Senate amendment will be agreed to, and that the State legislatures will be advised at once and permitted to pass on this important question in their respective current sessions.

Here today, we are only giving the people back home the right to say what they want. Three-fourths of the States must join two-thirds of the Congress in an affirmative vote before the Constitution can be amended. I believe the States will act speedily.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the present legislative situation or legislative status of this proposed amendment to the Constitution is such that naturally there is no opposition, as far as I know, certainly not on my part, to the motion made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

However, I want the RECORD to show that because there is no opposition at this legislative stage that does not mean that Members, like myself, vigorously oppose the passage of this legislation to amend the Constitution; and we hope that when it goes to the several legislatures that they will give profound consideration, as I am sure they will, to the serious implications involved if this amendment becomes a part of the organic law of our country.

During the debate when this resolution was before the House I said that putting this into the Constitution will tie the hands of future generations of Americans; that what we are doing today is not legislating for ourselves from a constitutional angle, but acting in a manner that will be binding upon future generations of Americans after we are dead and gone. Some time in the future, if our country is engaged in a war and our back is to the wall, and a future generation has a President whose second term is drawing to an end, this very amendment could produce a condition that might place future generations of Americans in a strait-jacket and seriously imperil the continued existence of our country.

I recognize that men have honest views both ways on this matter. I respect the views of those who are advocates of a two-term restriction, but I am very deeply concerned about the operation of this amendment if it becomes a part of the Constitution. The chances are that I will not be here and nobody in this body will be here when that occasion arises in the future, if it should. We will all have taken the journey by that time, in all probability. I hope no future generation of Americans will be faced with the problem, but we cannot eliminate the possibility that war will visit our country again in the future after we are dead and gone; and if it does, and if there is a good President in office leading our people at that time, and his second term is drawing to a close, this very amendment will have a serious and adverse effect upon the people of America and upon the very institutions of government in which we believe.

I emphasize this for whatever value it may have to the members of the several legislatures when this amendment comes before them on the question of ratification. This is a question they cannot escape. It is a question no thinking legislator in this Congress can just brush aside by saying we are referring it to the legislatures. When it gets to the members of the legislatures, they have their responsibility to pass upon the question. I passed upon it when the matter was in the House before and I am passing upon it now. I am very much disturbed about

the inflexibility of this amendment in binding Americans of tomorrow and preventing them from exercising a flexible judgment in meeting an emergency or an acute situation that may confront them after you and I are dead and gone.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. We hear a lot of talk these days about World War III, which we all hope and pray will never happen. Is it not a fact that if that sad day should ever come and some great man is President of this country, regardless of his political faith, and we are right in the middle of a terrible war where probably the result is in doubt, and three-fourths of the American States have adopted this amendment, we would be thrown into the throes of a great political contest and under no conditions could that man be reelected? That is the truth, is it not? I contend you can always trust the people and I am against this conference report.

Mr. McCORMACK. Undoubtedly. It is because of my disturbed state of mind, not in opposition to the action taken now, although I do not favor it, that I wanted the record to show that there was a voice raised at this stage of the legislative proceedings pointing out the danger that lies in the ultimate ratification of this amendment by three-fourths of the legislatures of the Union.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is very sincere and conscientious, as he always is, and he has made his usual good argument. He made this same argument when this resolution was considered by the House before it was voted on. The House passed this resolution by a vote of 285 for, and only 121 against. That resolution limited a President to not more than 8 years, or two terms, under any circumstances. There was a possibility that a Vice President might serve only one term of 4 years and a minor fraction of a second term.

The gentleman is quite right that all this resolution does is submit this question to the people, to the States, for their determination. The passage of this resolution is not binding until three-fourths of the States have affirmatively said that that is what they want. I have always felt that the people can be trusted when they are advised. The people back home know whether they want to limit the term of a President. They can and will vote intelligently, because the proposal has been debated for years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to make the observation at this time that the debate on this amendment in both bodies was of a very high character, and confining myself to commenting on the action in the House, the debate by Members on both sides of the aisle was on such a very high level I believe all of us can feel proud of it.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; the manner of approach has been in the right spir-

it. I was especially impressed with what the gentleman said when he took the floor a moment ago and expressed his views, but made it clear to the House that the majority of the House and the other body having acted, he was not in opposition to the action contemplated by my motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time because I do not want the impression to go out that Members on our side of the House do not want the legislatures of the various States to ratify this amendment.

Remember, this amendment would not prevent President Truman from succeeding himself in 1948 and 1952.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] talks about a contingency that may arise generations from now. My answer is that the Constitution can be amended at any time.

Talk about limitations on future generations—why, some of the greatest blessings we have ever enjoyed are found in the strict limitations placed in the Constitution by the founding fathers.

Talk about a condition arising in time of war? That has happened twice. During the War Between the States you had a Presidential election in 1864, right in the heat of the conflict.

They talk about a President passing away or leaving office in time of war. We had that happen in this war. Has it occurred to you that we changed Presidents before the war closed with either Germany or Japan?

Remember, it was Harry Truman who ordered the use of the atomic bomb that really ended the war with Japan.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one change I would like to see made. I am sorry the Senate did not provide that a man who had succeeded to the Presidency from the Vice Presidency would be eligible to two successive terms. But they did not see fit to do that, and we must vote for or against this amendment. However, they did so provide as to the present occupant of the White House.

In my opinion, the overwhelming majority of the legislatures of the various States will approve this amendment.

I call attention again to the fact that in 1861, when we knew we were going into a war and when our President of the Confederacy had already been selected, the Constitutional Convention of the Confederate States—which was composed of the best minds in the whole country—put a limitation of 6 years in their Constitution. No President, no matter how long the war might have lasted, could have served more than 6 years. Mr. Davis himself agreed to that limitation.

A great many Members wanted to put that limitation in this amendment. I thought it was best to limit it to two 4-year terms. But I do think the Senate acted wisely in providing that this limitation shall not prevent the present incumbent from succeeding himself in 1948 and in 1952; and also providing that any future President who has not served more than 2 years of a term to which he has succeeded may be a candidate for

reelection at the two succeeding elections. I am sorry they did not leave it, as I said, so that a man who has succeeded to the Presidency would be eligible to two successive terms.

But, taking it all in all, I think this amendment should be adopted, and I believe it will be approved by an overwhelming majority of the legislatures of the various States.

As for this matter of putting the people of the future in a strait-jacket, it does not do that; because, as I said, they have a right to change the Constitution at any time.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I was and am opposed to the bill to amend the Constitution so as to limit terms of President to two terms. I think the amendment made by the other body improves the original bill somewhat; this does not, however, change my attitude in opposition to the measure.

This subject was fully discussed by the framers of our Constitution, and in their combined judgment it was deemed unwise to limit the terms of a President to two. Situations and conditions can arise that would make it undesirable and contrary to the wishes of our people that such a limitation become a part of the organic law of the Nation. Recent occurrences confirm, in my mind, the danger of such a limitation. After all, it is a matter for the people and should remain so. One, to be elected one time or two times or three, must receive the nomination, and he must receive a majority of the votes of the people. To impress this two-term limitation or prohibition would deny the right or privilege of the people to have established their wishes and judgment that might be exercised in a case of emergency.

There is not even a fanciful danger that a third or fourth term will occur except under extreme circumstances. By the passage of this bill or resolution we do not escape our responsibility by saying that the matter is left to the States for their determination. The very passage of the bill or resolution is more than the granting of a privilege that the States vote on the question, but it is essentially an invitation to the States to do so. It would not be imagined that the Congress would adopt a resolution of this character unless it were the desire of Congress that it be accepted. What we do is to substantially place our approval upon this constitutional inhibition.

We, no doubt, will not again find it necessary to elect one to a third term or a fourth. What we propose to do is to deny to our posterity the privilege to protect themselves, if they will, from an apparent or certain hazard, which would occur through the removal of one the people desire to be President at a time that, in their opinion, might well result in a great danger to the Nation.

I just desire that any, in posterity, who may have occasion to wonder what my position is on this important subject may find it in the Record: That I am opposed to this legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 27, which relates to the Presidential tenure in office, came before Subcommittee No. 4 of the Judiciary

Committee, of which I am the chairman, and we gave this matter very careful consideration, which resulted in the reporting of the resolution which was then considered by the full Judiciary Committee, reported favorably, and which was then presented to the House and passed by the House by a rather large majority over the required two-thirds vote. This measure then went to the other body, and certain amendments have been adopted written into this resolution. While I far prefer the measure which was adopted by the House, and I prefer the language which was contained therein to that which is now contained in the amendment adopted by the other body, but in order to finally determine this subject and to fix a definite policy relating to the tenure of the office of our President, I am willing to yield to the amendments. This policy, if finally adopted, will be very helpful to both the people and any person aspiring to become President of this great Nation, I am confident.

Mr. Speaker, all of the Members are aware that the import of the pending resolution is that it merely seeks the authority to submit this question to the various State legislatures, and if three-fourths of the States, by and through their State legislatures, approve this policy of fixing the tenure of the office of our Chief Executive, then this joint resolution will become effective. Otherwise, it will have no force and effect. All will note that the additional amendment is incorporated in this resolution, by amendment adopted in the other body, that the provisions of the pending joint resolution does not apply to the present incumbent of the office of President.

The mere authority being granted in this joint resolution for the people, by and through their State legislatures, to pass upon the provisions contained therein is certainly a sound and constructive policy. I, as one Member, desire that the people have the full right and power, through their State legislatures, to determine this policy. All those who oppose this joint resolution, when the final vote is taken, will be in effect saying that they do not desire that the people, through the recognized processes of submitting this important subject to their State legislatures, have any voice in determining this question. What we need in this country is a little closer contact with the people, and to permit the people to participate in the functions of government, and the policies of government. This is one instance wherein the people should have the opportunity of expressing their views upon the policy of fixing the tenure of the office of President. Many of our Presidents have expressed their views upon this subject. Their expressed opinions should be carefully considered. The debates in the Constitutional Convention, upon this very question, lend much support to the fair and reasonable limitation fixed by the pending joint resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the House will accept the amendments adopted in the Senate, thereby finally concluding this measure insofar as this

legislative body is concerned. It is also my fervent hope that every State legislature will give this joint resolution very careful consideration, and, after consulting with the people generally, take such action thereon as is just and proper. The reasons mentioned today of fear for our future if this joint resolution is passed are, I am constrained to believe, groundless. In the last war, before it ended, we changed Presidents. In the Civil War, a kindred situation developed. It is unthinkable for us to believe that there are no craftsmen who are able to take the place of any man in any office or position. The people recognize that there are many—yes, many—who are able to assume the work of any person, in any position, at any time. I, therefore, hope this question may be concluded today by the acceptance of the amendments, and that this question may be submitted to the State legislatures for approval or rejection, as they may determine.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the splendid argument made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] was most convincing and this legislation, I fear, may come to plague us if the legislatures of two-thirds of the States should approve, which I hope they will not. It has been stated that while favorable action has been taken by Congress it does not mean that the various State legislatures would follow the action of Congress. However, I venture to say that in many of the States it will be felt that in view that Congress has acted that the legislatures should not deny favorable action on the amendment. Personally I would have preferred that instead of leaving the matter to the legislatures that we would have provided for conventions so that the real viewpoint of the people of the respective States would control.

I cannot quite understand why the majority feel the need of changing the Constitution which has stood us so well for 160 years. It is my opinion that only an extraordinary man, one of great ability, and one who had the interest of the country at heart, could be urged to run and be reelected to a third and fourth Presidential term, as was President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is certain that a weak man who did not enjoy the confidence of the people could not be reelected to a third or fourth term. Consequently, I voted against the original bill and shall vote against the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMASON) there were—ayes 81, noes 29.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may be permitted to extend their own remarks in the RECORD preceding the vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. KEEFE, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2700, Rept. No. 178) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. RAYBURN reserved all points of order on the bill.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE AND RINDERPEST

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 154, making appropriations for expenses incident to the control and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest, and ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to control and eradicate foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest as authorized by the act of February 28, 1947 (Public Law 8), and the act of May 29, 1884, as amended by the act of September 21, 1944 (21 U. S. C. 114a), fiscal year 1947, \$9,000,000, to be available for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of said Public Law 8 until June 30, 1948.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there is a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak amongst cattle in Mexico, and it is spreading very rapidly. The Mexican Government has agreed to put in about \$9,350,000. We have been authorized to move into the picture by the Gillie bill, Public Law No. 8, which was passed a short time ago. The Department of Agriculture is ready to step in. At the present time Mexico has 25,000 troops keeping a quarantine on these cattle.

These foot-and-mouth disease outbreaks are very expensive and are very difficult to handle. Unless we move in rapidly, it is going to be disastrous to our entire livestock industry all over the North American Continent.

What bothers me about it is that the program of the Department of Agriculture is so slow. They propose only to

kill 2,000 animals a day, whereas I believe they should equip themselves to take care of 20,000 and get it cleaned up immediately before it spreads any farther.

I do not feel that the Appropriations Committee on the House of Representatives should take a chance on having any responsibility placed on their shoulders for failure to meet this situation.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Coming as I do from the Mexican border and being more or less familiar with the seriousness of the situation in Mexico, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for this prompt action. The situation is not only serious. It is very alarming. I think perhaps they are beginning to make some headway to get it under control. Time is of the essence, and I urge prompt and effective action to stamp out this dread disease.

Mr. TABER. The Department of Agriculture is moving too slow.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; I agree with that. I hope this will be the means of speeding it up. I agree in what the gentleman said about the slowness of the program but I think that was largely because they have not had enough money to proceed with the full program.

Mr. TABER. They did not ask for the money until yesterday, and we are giving our approval today.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I simply wish to make the point that the committee acted immediately after the Department brought the request for the funds and reported the bill out on the very next day.

Mr. THOMASON. We from the cattle country are very happy at the promptness with which the committee acted. I hope the Department of Agriculture will follow your fine example.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The legislative act requires 30-day reports from the Secretary of Agriculture. I am merely suggesting that the Members, especially the committee and those from the cattle areas, should interest themselves personally in those reports to see that action comes from the Secretary on this foot-and-mouth-disease problem.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 154 provides for an appropriation of \$9,000,000 for use in carrying out the joint United States-Mexican program for exterminating foot-and-mouth disease in the Republic of Mexico through June 30, 1947.

Inasmuch as both the House and Senate unanimously approved American participation in this important program less than a month ago, there should be no opposition to the appropriation of this comparatively modest sum.

I am pleased to report that rapid progress in formulating an effective campaign against foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico has been made in recent weeks by officials of the two governments.

Meeting in Washington, officials representing Mexican agriculture and the United States Department of Agriculture have made a careful estimate of expenses incurred by the Mexican Government since the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, and probable expenses through June 30, 1947, of both Governments in order to carry out an effective campaign.

It was my pleasure to meet with these officials last week and have them as my guests at the Capitol. Many of you met them at that time. They included the Honorable Oscar Flores, Mexican Under Secretary of Animal Industry; Ignacio de la Torre, representing the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Industry of Mexico, and Adolfo Alarcon, Agricultural Attaché of the Mexican Embassy.

Representing the American Government in conference with these gentlemen were W. V. Lambert, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Administration; Dr. B. T. Simms, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry; and John A. Hopkins, of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

The following findings and recommendations resulted from these conferences:

Whereas Mexico is incurring expenses for services, personnel, equipment, and supplies which are estimated to amount to \$7,600,000 up to June 30, and will be responsible for indemnities to be paid for slaughter of hogs, goats, and sheep, which will amount to a sum of approximately \$1,750,000, making a total Mexican contribution of \$9,350,000 for this period.

It is recommended: 1. That the United States contribution for this period should consist of expenses for equipment, supplies, personnel, and so forth, amounting to approximately \$1,500,000, plus indemnities of \$7,600,000 for cattle slaughtered, making a total of \$9,000,000.

2. That any salvage recovered by Mexico from animals slaughtered during the campaign should be used in the joint campaign in addition to the services already rendered by Mexico, and, with regard to the continuation of the joint program for the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico after July 1, 1947.

Whereas Mexico hopes to continue its expenditures at approximately the same rate as during the months April-June 1947, but foresees that it will not be able to increase this rate of expenditure,

It is further recommended: 1. That, if a fully effective program of eradication is to be carried on during the succeeding 12 months, the United States Government be prepared to increase its rate of expenditures, the amount of such increase to be dependent on the total expenditures necessary for the period from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the two appalling features of this disease are first, its incurability, and second, the alarming rapidity with which it is disseminated.

The only remedy is extermination. All infected animals, or animals exposed to infection, must be slaughtered promptly and either incinerated or

buried at least 7 feet deep and beyond all possibility of disinterment.

It spreads with such rapidity, carried by men, dogs, and birds, that if allowed to take its course, it would within a short time eliminate the livestock industry. It first appeared in Mexico in December and although quarantined and opposed by every resource of the Mexican Government, it is now distributed through 10 Mexican States and already has traveled a distance of 250 miles.

The disease is not restricted to cattle but affects all cloven-footed animals, including goats, deer, sheep, and hogs. Its impact upon the livestock of the country is as deadly as an outbreak of smallpox among primitive nomadic tribes in the last century, and unless controlled would eventually wipe out a large part of the animal life of North America.

Some scientists have advanced the idea that the possibility of the incidence of some such disease may explain the mysterious disappearance of prehistoric animals, such as the dinosaur, the largest animal of all time, which roamed through the length and breadth of North America in countless numbers during the Cretaceous period and then became extinct although there was no form of animal life on the globe at the time which could have brought about its extinction.

Although the Mexican Government has deployed an army of 25,000 men about the infected area and is making every effort to restrict and exterminate it, the problem is of such serious proportions, and the disease is advancing so rapidly toward our own borders that it is necessary for us to cooperate at once. Frankly, the \$9,000,000 carried in the pending bill will not be sufficient to see us through. But it is all that can be utilized at this time and will carry on the work until further funds can be provided.

The report accompanying the resolution is somewhat misleading in that it may serve to give the impression that the Department of Agriculture has not moved with sufficient celerity and is not attacking the problem with sufficient emphasis.

Quite the contrary is true. The news of the outbreak, with the suggestion that the contagion might be the dreaded foot-and-mouth disease, reached the Department one afternoon. Early the next morning a plane was dispatched with American scientists to the scene of the outbreak. The telegram announcing that the diagnosis was unmistakable was received at the Department at 5 o'clock p. m. and at 5:30 o'clock telegrams were dispatched alerting all stations and closing the Mexican border to importations of susceptible animals and taking every other step warranted by the situation.

The delay intervening between that time and this was due to the necessity of the Mexican authorities completing their plans and securing authorization for negotiations. The representatives of the Mexican Government with final authority to act reached Washington Saturday and the American Department of Agriculture promptly concluded arrangements and forwarded a budget estimate through regular channels to the

House on Monday. In the meantime materials had been located, contracts prepared and every action taken that could be taken in advance of concordance with the Mexican Government and appropriation by the Congress.

I congratulate the Department and those in charge of this work for the aggressive and efficient way in which they have met the situation. It could not have been more ably or more expeditiously handled.

It has been suggested that the rate of slaughter of 2,000 head of cattle a day is too low and indicates either lack of appreciation of the situation or failure to meet it with all available resources. On the contrary, the processing and slaughter of 2,000 head per day is the limit of physical capacity—especially in the early days of the campaign. The process of acquisition, indemnification, and eradication, with all the attending difficulties of salvage of exposed but uninfected animals over so wide and broken a terrain presents obstacles insurmountable at a greater rate of speed, while the cooperation of owners, processors, and officials is being enlisted and a routine established.

As a matter of fact the Committee on Appropriations has acted only and solely on the advice and suggestion of the Department. The amount of the \$9,000,000 appropriation itself was determined by the Department and not by the committee, which merely approved it.

But time is short and the committee is to be commended for the promptness with which it has cooperated. I trust the House will likewise cooperate with a unanimous vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSION asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include therein a letter from Mr. Ernest T. Weir, president of the Weirton Steel Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

DISTRIBUTION AND PRICING OF SUGAR

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 146, to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 146, relating to the distribution and pricing of sugar, with Mr. COLE of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the purposes of House Joint Resolution 146,

which is before us for consideration, quite generally meet the approval of the House. The Committee on Banking and Currency held rather extensive hearings and debated it quite at length, and it was reported out of the committee unanimously with the reservation, as is usual, that the committee members might take any position they cared to on the floor with respect to amendments or the final disposition of the resolution.

The resolution, in substance, provides for the continuance of the sugar rationing and the pricing of sugar until October 31, 1947, with the provision that the Secretary of Agriculture is granted the authority to continue inventory controls between October 31, 1947 and March 31, 1948, when, under the provisions of the resolution, all controls over the rationing of sugar shall expire.

It will be recalled that the authority to ration sugar is contained in the Second War Powers Act which, unless it is extended by the Congress, expires on March 31, 1947, and the power to control prices of sugar is found in the Emergency Price Control and Stabilization Acts. That authority, unless the Congress moves to continue it, expires on June 30, 1947.

In this bill we seek to dispose of both of the questions of rationing and of pricing, and the controls in this resolution are set up separately and independently of any other powers and machinery provided for in the Second War Powers Act and the Emergency Price Control and Rationing Acts. It is contemplated that the Office of Price Administration shall be discontinued as such on or before June 30, 1947. The powers to ration sugar and control the price of sugar is continued under the provisions of this resolution under the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of Agriculture. Provision is made for the transfer of appropriations and personnel, but the policy making will henceforth be in the Department of Agriculture.

Now, the need for the legislation is quite generally accepted and I think quite apparent. I think you get a great deal of detailed information from the report of the committee.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. An important correction should be made in the report on page 10. The reason for the correction is a typographical error. I should like to read the last sentence of the conclusion as it should appear in the report:

It feels that with the increased sugar available during 1947, over 1946, for industrial users that the reasonable needs of new users and the reasonable relief of hardship cases including provision of sugar to prevent the wastage of milk—

Not milk—

and other food products, must be provided for by the Secretary of Agriculture.

It was the will of the committee that this direction should be given to the Secretary of Agriculture in order that the wastage of milk, which has already occurred and which would increase in the future, might be stopped.

The preservation of food is certainly very important. I call the attention of my colleagues to page 162 of the hearings, where Mr. Holman, Secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, summarized the situation and expressed his deep interest in this matter.

Said Mr. Holman:

Large amounts of skim milk will go to waste or be lost for human consumption unless sugar is made available to process it. The Government agencies have indicated that they will not make the necessary sugar available unless they are compelled to do so by Congress.

The committee, therefore, agreed to make the intent of the resolution now before us clear by putting into the report the language which I have read in its correct form.

I shall not take any further time. I believe my very able and distinguished chairman will support me in what I have said.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. It is a typographical error, where the word "milk" appears in the line quoted by the gentleman from Iowa. It should be "milk."

I may say that the intent of the committee in that respect is further set forth in the language on page 12 of the report, which reads as follows:

It is the intention of the committee that the Secretary of Agriculture, in carrying out this provision—

As respects new users, users who did not have a base period, and hardship cases—

shall make just and reasonable provision for meeting the need for sugar in hardship cases (including cases where sugar is needed to avoid wastage of milk or other food products) and for the needs of new sugar users, and the needs of those who have no base-period history. It is provided that the Secretary shall act without regard to other law, because it is believed that he should not be bound by the provisions of title II of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944.

That was put in because of the Moberly against Anderson & Fleming case, with which you are all familiar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Getting back to the hardship cases, I know definitely that in the past the Department has discriminated against people where there is a change or transfer of ownership. I know of one case where there were two competitors. One of them sold his business to an individual, and that new individual was denied the same rights as his competitor because there was this transfer in ownership. I wonder if the gentleman would be so kind as to tell the House whether it is not the intent of this bill that there shall be no discrimination where there is a transfer in ownership, providing the person who purchases it continues the same line of business and the same use of sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

In answer to the gentleman I may say that there should be no question in re-

spect to those cases where the purchaser of the property is a veteran. It has always been customary for them to take care of the veterans in that particular.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I mean irrespective of veterans. I am talking of someone who is not a veteran.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have a letter here on that subject from Mr. Irvin L. Rice, Acting Deputy Commissioner for Sugar, Sugar Department, Office of Temporary Controls, and I shall include this as part of my remarks. It is as follows:

OFFICE OF TEMPORARY CONTROLS,
Washington, D. C.

The Honorable JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency
Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOLCOTT: You have requested further information as to the right of a purchaser of a going sugar-using business to receive the sugar allotment of that business under the sugar-rationing programs in line with testimony given before your committee last week by Mr. George Dice. Since Mr. Dice is no longer with this office, I have undertaken to supply the information you request.

Section 18.3 of Third Revised Ration Order 3 is the section which governs the transfer of sugar bases and allotments when the transferor disposes of all or part of his sugar-using operations. A transfer to the purchaser of a proportionate part or all of the sugar base of the business will be made if both transferor and transferee notify the appropriate sugar branch office of the sale of the business, and if the transferee will continue to serve the same area, and the same class of customers, with the same class of products as were formerly produced by the transferor. These requirements are, of course, designed to permit the normal consumer of the products of the business the opportunity to continue to receive them.

The transferee need not continue to use the same premises and facilities for his operation as were formerly used by the transferor. From our standpoint all that is necessary to be transferred are the assets of the particular establishment which go to the make-up of that establishment as a going concern. These assets include, of course, the good will, lists of customers or routes, and things of a like nature which are essential to the continued operation of the business by the transferee.

I should like to point out that, in the case of veterans' sugar bases assigned under Revised General Ration Order 18, the rule is somewhat different. In such cases, the transfer of the sugar base is permissible within a year after the establishment has begun to operate only if the transferee is himself a qualified veteran or if he acquires the business by inheritance on the death of the veteran owner of the establishment. However, after the establishment has been in operation for more than a year it may be transferred to any person under the provisions of Third Revised Ration Order 3 mentioned above. The purpose of this 1-year limitation upon transferability of veterans' sugar bases is to prevent the fraudulent use of veterans by established users or otherwise ineligible persons as mere devices for obtaining sugar bases or additions to their established bases.

I trust this supplies the information you desire. If I can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

IRVIN L. RICE,
Acting Deputy Commissioner for
Sugar Department.

In accordance with this letter, the purchaser of the business is subrogated to all the rights of the person from whom the

business was purchased had, if he carries on the same business. If he indulges in new practices, if he expands the business and goes into the manufacture or processing of new products, then he becomes a new user and would be considered under the other provisions of the law; but if he carries on the same business, producing the same article, he gets all the rights the person from whom he bought had.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I was listening very carefully but I still cannot understand clearly what the gentleman means by new users. I looked at the report and also the hearings, and I have not been able up to this time to inform myself clearly as to what is meant by new users.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It does not make very much difference. If they are not classified as new users, then they are probably being taken care of at the present time, and if they are classified as new users, whether by reason of expansion of existing business or by having just gone into business, then it is our intention that the Secretary of Agriculture shall make provision for such users consistent with the over-all program. But our intent very clearly is that the Secretary of Agriculture shall make available some sugar for new users. We have deplored the fact that there is a possibility under the practice which has heretofore been indulged in of freezing such an important segment of our economy as to put the Congress in the position where by legislation it not only condones but almost participates in violations of the spirit, at least, of the Sherman Antitrust Act. We wish to avoid this in the pending legislation.

Mr. OWENS. But I do not think the point is made clear enough with reference to those who have struggled through the years regarding sugar as to whether or not it is going to affect them. I agree with the gentleman but I do not believe it is made clear enough.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it might affect them somewhat. It will affect them this way. An existing business anticipates an expansion predicated upon an increase in availability of sugar which will give it an increase in its allotment. If we make provisions for new users, that must, of course, come out of any increases which the old users would otherwise get.

Mr. OWENS. I do not see how you can justify continuing the rationing of sugar in that way and permit new users who come into the market to get an increase in sugar.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Would you be against the rationing of sugar to new users?

Mr. OWENS. No, but all I am saying is that it is not explained sufficiently.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I say that the only alternative would be to set aside a certain percentage of sugar to new users. It is difficult to determine what percentage should be granted to new users or left to the old users. You have to leave

the administration of this law to someone. You cannot legislate common sense into the administration of any law. But if common sense is not used in the administration of a law, then, of course, the Congress is always here to check against it and to make provisions to correct any abuses. All of the extension bills for OPA which we have ever had before the Congress have been predicated upon faulty administration, at least, by the Office of Price Administration. It is hoped by transferring the administration of this law to the Secretary of Agriculture the whole economy will get somewhat more sympathetic consideration.

Mr. OWENS. I agree with the gentleman, but I still feel that it is giving dictatorial powers to one man without clearly defining them.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. TALLE. Supplementing what my chairman has said about transfers of titles to plants and whether a sugar quota passes with the title to the buyer, I may say that I interrogated Mr. Dice on that very matter, and the colloquy may be found on pages 112 and 113 of the printed hearings pertaining to the pending resolution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I go on and put these figures in the RECORD justifying this continuance and state very briefly what we may expect the picture to be this year.

I think the sugar situation is getting very, very much better. In 1945, we had available to the United States for all purposes 5,085,908 short tons. In 1946, we had available 5,479,529 short tons, and it is estimated in 1947 we shall have available 6,800,000 short tons. These figures are in terms of raw sugar values. That is quite an increase, and there is a possibility of our getting even more sugar if the Cuban sugar crop comes up to latest expectations. So, I think we can be assured that by the latter part of this year the supply is reasonably going to approach demands.

We are assured that there is going to be almost enough to give the American people on a per capita basis within 10 pounds per annum of normal consumption. The normal consumption by the people of the United States is about 103 pounds raw value. We are assured that this year the American people on a per capita basis will get about 93 pounds raw value. One pound of refined sugar equals 1.07 pounds raw value.

So we are approaching that period, if we use judgment, when it will be perfectly safe without injury to the housewife and without injury to the commercial or industrial user, to take controls off altogether.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. This bill keeps the Government controls until October 31 of this year. Are the people of the United States to understand that at that time Government controls will cease?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is the recommendation of the committee, excepting that inventory controls may be continued until March 31, 1948.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman explain what he means by "inventory controls?"

Mr. WOLCOTT. I cannot. It would seem to me that something has to be done with it. I am so far protecting the committee bill. The committee in its judgment accepted that. I would have preferred to handle it otherwise. I am just a little fearful that unless we do something with that language, it will be assumed that we have continued the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to continue sugar rationing until March 31, because we do not say that only commercial inventories shall be continued. We say "inventories." Of course, that might include sugar which the housewives may have in the sugar bowls. I will later offer an amendment to clarify our intentions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, where an old-established firm, using a certain amount of sugar, buys another firm that is run down at the heel, and they wish to build up this company, not in its own city or even in its own State, and he comes down to Washington and asks assistance in getting a sugar allotment to take care of that business, is he going to receive the same kind of treatment after this bill is passed that he is receiving now from this group which you just got through saying we could not legislate any common sense in? I do not think they have any kind of sense—common or uncommon.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is the hope of the committee that the administration of this law from this time on will be more sympathetic. But the answer to the problem is not to take off controls, because if you take off controls you would have the commercial bidding successfully in the open market, either with or without price control, for supplies with which to build up inventories. What I think we have to be very careful about here is that feature. I think we should generally have this in mind throughout these discussions, that what the committee has attempted to do and what the Congress should try to do is to prevent the creation of a situation where, by competition in the open market, the housewife will be prejudiced to the point where she will not be able to get any sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this was a unanimous report of the committee. That does not mean there were not some sharp differences of opinion as to what the bill should contain. Controls were the result of the war. I have heard some gentlemen speak of the controls as totalitarian, and they seem to draw no distinction between controls which a dictator places upon

his people to enslave them and controls which a freely elected Congress places upon those who freely elected them, for their own good.

Controls during the great emergency of the war were absolutely essential to preserve the economy of our Nation. The taking off of those controls is liable to produce an issue as explosive as putting them on. This is no time to make controls a whipping boy, because if you do the result may be disastrous to those who take that action.

Nobody wants controls. I think all reasonable people want free enterprise and the competitive system. I would like to go back tomorrow to the conditions that prevailed long before that great emergency which the Democratic Party inherited years ago, and long before the war; but conditions make it imperative that we continue these controls. You all know the hazards of agriculture. Nobody can tell what the sugar crop will be this year. There was a wide diversity of opinion before the committee as to what sugar would be produced this year. There is a shortage of sugar. Sugar is the most generally demanded product in the world. There is a world demand. The alternative that presented itself to the committee under this bill was whether rationing would cease on the 31st day of March and price control would cease on the 30th of June. If no legislation is enacted, all controls would go off on the 30th of June of this year.

The bill as originally introduced provided that price control should cease on October 31, but the Secretary of Agriculture afterwards felt it was necessary and in the public interest to continue those controls until the 31st of March of next year. I thought that was a wise provision, for when controls go off under this bill Congress will not be in session. The controls will cease on the 31st of October.

I do not believe either the consumer or the producer wants a disorganized market. I do not believe either would profit by a runaway price of sugar. The producer, of course, might benefit for a short time, but in the long run it would be disastrous to both the producer and the consumer. I think there ought to be discretion somewhere when the date arrives on which these controls are removed to say whether or not it is advisable to remove them on that date. I am for the bill, of course, as compared with the present legislation. I believe the Secretary of Agriculture is the proper person in whom to lodge this discretion.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. As I understand, then, the bill does two things: First, it does away with OPA control over sugar.

Mr. SPENCE. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And it reposes all controls in the Secretary of Agriculture until the 31st of October.

Mr. SPENCE. And transfers to the Secretary of Agriculture all existing machinery and available funds.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Until the 31st of October.

Mr. SPENCE. Until the 31st of October.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is there any other provision of law under which the Secretary of Agriculture would have control after the 31st of October?

Mr. SPENCE. None that I know of.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No rationing, no price control?

Mr. SPENCE. None that I know of except the control of inventories until the 31st of March. What inventory control means and how far that goes I do not know. I do not think it means ordinary price control or rationing.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It would probably operate something like a floor-tax control. Anyhow, he has that discretion after the 31st of October?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes; after the 31st of October, but the control over rationing and price ceases abruptly.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Would the gentleman construe inventory control to go so far as to inventory the sugar in the hands of the consumer, for instance, the housewife?

Mr. SPENCE. No; I do not think so.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Would it go so far as to require inventory controls of sugar in the hands of little independent grocers or some small retailer?

Mr. SPENCE. I have no definition of inventory control, but I think it would be probably applied to large holders of sugar. I do not believe the Government will go into every kitchen to see what the housewife has on her shelves. I do not believe there is anything like that in contemplation.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Would the gentleman construe it to mean that it covers the large industrial users of sugar and the wholesalers?

Mr. SPENCE. It seems to me it will be limited. I cannot believe the Secretary of Agriculture would want to go into the kitchen of the housewife to see how much she has on hand.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPENCE. Certainly.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. See if this expresses it correctly: As I understand sugar was the first commodity put under the control of OPA and it is the last one to be taken out from under control, and with the coming of October 31 all rationing of all commodities will go?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes. It was placed under control of OPA because of necessity and because of the shortage of supply. It is still controlled because of shortage of supply. The only hope is that the supply will equal the demand, for if it does not we will see a spiral rise in the price of sugar that will cost the housewife millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. What is the purpose of inventory control if rationing and price controls go off? What is the advantage of it?

Mr. SPENCE. I suppose inventory control after rationing and price controls are removed would tend to prevent hoarding. Some people might hoard sugar for the purpose of selling it afterwards at a profit.

Mr. BONNER. Suppose that takes place. Then what can the Secretary of Agriculture do about it under this bill?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not know what he is going to do about it.

Mr. BONNER. That is why I am asking the question, What is the advantage of this inventory control?

Mr. SPENCE. It will tend to prevent hoarding of sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I would like to ask the gentleman if this bill outlines any specific policy and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to do any specific thing as far as limiting the amount of rationing is concerned?

Mr. SPENCE. No; that is left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture under general powers. He has additional power that he did not have before to render decisions in hardship cases, which I think is a very wise plan.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that the passage of this bill will keep the housewife in enough sugar, that is, as far as the policy goes, to continue her through October 31?

Mr. SPENCE. There will be no change in the administration until that time except that it is transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The point I am trying to make is this: As I understand, the passage of this bill is to avoid chaos and confusion in the whole sugar picture.

Mr. SPENCE. The same methods will be pursued, I presume, that have been pursued heretofore.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman feels that it is necessary now?

Mr. SPENCE. I do. I feel the bill is necessary, and between the two alternatives that present themselves, I am certainly for the bill.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. I do not ask this question to be critical at all, but purely for information. Why is it that inventory control is so hard to explain, and why is it in the bill if no one seems to know just what it means? I would like to have a little enlightenment on it. I am not critical in asking the question.

Mr. SPENCE. I cannot give the gentleman a definite answer on inventory control. I presume it means that it is not spelled out in the bill. I presume it means that the Secretary would have control of the inventories of large users, to prevent hoarding of sugar, which they would naturally do, and I certainly do not think it is the import of the bill to give control to those engaged in the industries in which sugar is used.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that everybody in the Chamber desires to get back to free enterprise as soon as possible. We do not want any further regimentation unless it is absolutely necessary. We do not want any further controls on food or anything else unless it is necessary.

I know very little about sugar, but I was present and I heard all the witnesses who testified before the committee. I think what the people of America want is more sugar, but I am satisfied that if they knew they were not going to get more sugar, they would not want to pay a higher price for the sugar that they are getting and will receive. I am convinced that if you decontrol sugar at this particular time, the allocation will not be greater, and the price will jump sky high.

Now, here is what the witnesses testified to before us. I would like to say at this point that this bill extends price and ration control only until October 31 of this year, and inventory control until March 31 of next year, and provides that such controls shall be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture. Now, what we mean by inventory control is those engaged in selling sugar. We do not want those engaged in selling sugar to withhold it from the consumers.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Would the gentleman have any objection to an amendment on page 6 where inventory control is mentioned, but it makes no distinction as to whether that shall be commercial or industrial control? This could mean housewives' inventory, also.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I do not have any objection to that, and the amendment should prevail. I brought out from witnesses myself that of this increased amount produced this year housewives will get a larger percentage than industrial users. I think the gentleman was there and heard some of the witnesses. I think the housewives should have more. I am in favor of giving the housewives, the people at home, a larger amount than industrial users.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman give the House any explanation as to the meaning of the language in lines 17 and 18 on page 6 of the resolution?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. What does it say?

Mr. DONDERO. It refers to the inventory which may be continued until March 31, 1948.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This means the inventory of the amount of sugar a dealer has on hand to sell and does not refer to the consumer. That is my interpretation. The fellow that sells the sugar does not have the right to hold it. He should not obtain a whole lot of sugar and then refuse to sell it to the consumers. A lot of people would do that

with the idea that the sugar price would be increased when the controls were taken away, and it would not be distributed properly.

Mr. DONDERO. Did anybody appear before the gentleman's committee and make an explanation as to just what that did mean, if it was different from what the gentleman has just stated? The gentleman is the first one to explain it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think everybody understood it that way. There was no necessity for explaining it.

A number of witnesses, representing consumers, producers, refiners, processors, wholesalers, retailers, and all classes engaged in the sugar industry, testified before the committee. Practically all of the witnesses stated it would not do to remove restrictions at this time, either on rationing of sugar or ceiling prices for sugar, for the reason that to do so would not bring any more production at this time but certainly would increase the price of sugar and would cause an uneven distribution of sugar in this country.

The testimony of the witnesses showed that production will be about 13 percent more this year than last year, and that another similar increase by next year would bring enough sugar to satisfy the needs for family use and industrial use.

All witnesses wanted continued restrictions on sugar no longer than necessary. Many of them stated that the law should be extended to at least October 31 of this year, as all of the crop will have been planted and much of it harvested by that time, and many others stated that authority for the controls should be extended to March 31, 1948.

The evidence shows that the needs of the United States for this year will be something over 8,000,000 short tons and that the sugar we will produce in the United States this year and our share of the sugar we have contracted for in other countries, including Cuba, will amount to something like 6,800,000 short tons. This estimate is based on acreage planted and to be planted. Therefore we will have a shortage this year of over 1,000,000 tons. It is expected that 6,800,000 tons will provide a per capita consumption for the year of about 87 pounds of refined sugar or 93 pounds raw value, as compared with the prewar per capita consumption of about 96 pounds of refined sugar or 103 pounds of raw value. We find ourselves facing an estimated shortage of more than a million tons of sugar, and there is no possible place in the world from which we can obtain more at any price. So we are forced to the conclusion, so far as this crop is concerned, that we will not get any more sugar for the housewives if controls are taken off, but probably the users of sugar would have to pay many times more than the present price.

I think every member of the Committee and of Congress would like to take controls off sugar at this time if we thought we would get more sugar, even at some reasonable increase in the price, but from the evidence produced to us, this is not the case, but the evidence is encouraging from the standpoint that we will have enough sugar produced to meet the needs for next year.

We all remember 1920 following World War I when the price of sugar went to 27 cents and more per pound. To take controls off at this time, might cause sugar to go this high again, with prospect of not getting any more sugar to satisfy the needs of our people. The evidence shows that uneven distribution and confusion would result and the probability is that housewives and small users would find that they had considerably less sugar than under a rationing system, and this is one reason there is such unanimity of opinion of all those in the sugar industry, including growers, processors, refiners, and trade associations representing such groups as ice cream, evaporated milk, confectioners, bottling, and many other manufacturers.

It is my understanding that a larger percent of increased production for this year was or will be given to housewives over industrial users, which is fair and right. Everyone knows that when sugar is in short supply and without allocation and equal distribution, the first to suffer will be the housewives and then the small industrial users. Many small users have no warehouse facilities for storing sugar nor the funds with which to buy large stocks like large industrial users, and as long as sugar is in short supply the people who would profit would be the speculators and the large users. The small users and the housewives cannot compete with the large users in this short field of supply.

People must understand that we produce in continental United States less than one-third enough sugar to supply our needs. Therefore we have to contract with producers outside of this country to obtain most of our sugar.

We contracted for the entire Cuban sugar crop, of which 3,150,000 short tons will come to the United States. It is thought that Cuba will produce around 5,500,000 short tons. We sent last year 400,000 tons to Europe and other foreign countries. It is estimated we will send less than that this year. This sugar shipped from the United States to foreign countries did not come out of our domestic supplies, but represents sugar that was brought from Cuba to this country for refining and subsequent shipment rather than being shipped direct from Cuba to the foreign countries.

The United States has been purchasing the entire quantity of Cuban sugar during the past few years, with the exception of the relatively small quantity reserved for local consumption in Cuba and for shipment to other American countries. The United States purchase, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, is made in behalf of all the countries which normally purchase some sugar in Cuba. This arrangement, whereby the United States is the sole purchaser, prevents the chaotic condition which would result if all the countries went into Cuba and bid against each other for the available supplies of sugar. This purchasing arrangement naturally leaves the United States with an obligation to share the sugar with the other countries in whose behalf we have purchased a part of it.

Under such arrangement, we will receive two-thirds of the sugar exported from Cuba this year and foreign coun-

tries will receive one-third. This represents our normal share of Cuban sugar. Also we get all the sugar that is produced in other countries, Puerto Rico and Hawaii, except what is needed for home consumption.

Since the Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased the entire Cuban sugar crop, the foreign countries receive their share of the Cuban sugar by accepting assignments of the CCC contract for their share of the sugar. This permits the foreign countries to make settlement directly with Cuba for the sugar they receive. In other words, we do not guarantee anything. We just assign them a part of the contract, and then they pay direct to Cuba and we are not involved in that. The Commodity Credit Corporation therefore assumes no financial risks on the sugar that is shipped to foreign countries.

Out of the 5,500,000 short tons produced in Cuba, 750,000 short tons is reserved for home consumption and for sale to other Latin-American countries.

Mr. Chairman, when we all understand the sugar situation I think we will be forced to one conclusion, that unless we extend for a short while the rationing and controls, we will not get any more sugar, and we all know we will have to pay a much higher price for the sugar that we do consume.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brown] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 146, to extend the powers and authority under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, has at least two serious flaws in it if the purpose of the resolution is to get rid of political control over sugar. The resolution provides for continuing price control and rationing of sugar until October 31, 1947. Then it qualifies this provision by providing that authority to continue inventory controls of sugar may be exercised until March 31, 1948. I think inventory control can become just as objectionable as rationing. If my memory serves me correctly, Administration witnesses testified against inventory control ostensibly on the ground that it would be difficult to operate. My objection to it is that it not only would be difficult to operate but impossible to operate equitably. I also object to it because it leaves the control boys with a string to the whole program of price ceilings on and rationing of sugar.

If it is really the intention of Congress to end political interference with sugar on that date, the bill should provide for ending price control and rationing of sugar on October 31, 1947—period.

But there is a far more serious flaw involved in this bill than inventory control. I refer to the power exercised by the International Emergency Food Council to pool the world's sugar supply and to ration out of that pool the United States share of sugar. The point is that even if the joint resolution before us does everything its face would indicate, we would still have rationing of sugar.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Has the gentleman been able to find any place in the statute books where the Congress of the United States has authorized an international board to determine how much sugar the American people should have?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am quite sure that the Congress never gave such authority. I am coming to that point in just a moment.

Mr. BUFFETT. One other question. When our committee met on this problem and as the Congress meets now, we are operating sort of like a coroner's jury—holding an inquest over how the sugar that has been allocated to us by an international board shall be disposed of. Is that right?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is correct.

The International Emergency Food Council, one of the elements of world government, would continue to tell the United States how much sugar we can have. This would be true even if the United States increased its own sugar production. The people of the United States no longer have the power to say whether or not they shall eat the sugar they produce; that is now left to the one-world government, and this is something we ought to tell the housewives when they write to us for more sugar. Here again the political regime controlling our Government, which craves control and more control, is vested with an extraordinary power to manipulate our sugar supply.

I cannot find any legal authority whereby the President is given the power to enter into any international agreement which gives foreigners control over the sugar we produce.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. This International Board of Control the gentleman talks about met here in Washington about a month ago, did it not?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am not sure.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I believe they did. They give us the right to have a representative on that board, do they?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Oh, I think they extend us that little privilege.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. They give us that much courtesy, do they?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I suppose so.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Who is our representative on the board?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I understand the President is supposed to be.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. He, of course, does not sit on any board.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But he is supposed to have the matter under his jurisdiction and he has, I believe designated the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman will yield, it is Secretary Anderson.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. So far as I can learn it is just another one of those self-constituted powers of which we experienced so many in the last few years. In this connection it should be mentioned that the one-world government is not only telling the people of the United States how much sugar they can eat, but

also how much wheat and other foods; indeed, it is in the process of applying the same principle to everything we produce. If the people of the United States like this sort of arrangement, if they are willing to share their produce with the rest of the world they have the right to do so. I doubt, however, that they have any such desire.

Certainly it is the duty of every Congressman to inform his constituents of the facts of the situation. They should know if they have not already learned that the political forces controlling our Government are giving America away as fast as they can, and so far as I am aware the United States Congress is doing nothing about it; indeed, it is lending itself to supporting this insane and suicidal policy.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. I believe the gentleman is performing a public service in calling these facts to the attention of the American people, but does not the gentleman believe that this bill cannot properly deal with the question he has raised, the second question, the one of international control? After all, this particular bill is merely to end sugar rationing in the United States, and this international situation does not properly fall within the scope of the pending legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It certainly falls within the scope of the Congress of the United States and I think it is important enough that the Congress should give attention to it.

Mr. KUNKEL. Perhaps so, but it does not come within the scope of the pending legislation which deals purely with domestic matters.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But in dealing with this important question in which an international board tells us how much sugar we can have, I think it is certainly relevant to go into the collateral issues of similar nature. This is a bill to continue sugar control, yet we are letting word go out to the people today that we are here considering ways and means for doing away with sugar controls to the extent that we can get more sugar. We are not doing our full duty, so long as we do not tell them about this entire international arrangement.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman mentioned the international board and its activities. I call to the gentleman's attention an indication that there are some forces at work to limit the importation of Cuban sugar which during the war constituted a considerable source of supply to the people of the United States. Has the gentleman any information as to what this international board is going to do in relation to limiting the export of Cuban sugar to the United States?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. How can anybody know what any international body is going to do?

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. I understand the International Emergency Food Council allotted from the Cuban crop somewhere in the neighborhood of 3,150,000 tons. There seems to be good reason to believe that the Cuban crop will exceed the estimate made at that time by 650,000 tons. Is there machinery by which that can be allotted to American housewives for canning purposes? Or does it have to lie in warehouses until the International Emergency Food Council meets again?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No; there is machinery to prevent it from coming into the United States; that is the International Emergency Food Council.

Mr. KUNKEL. In other words, as it stands, it will not come in.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. We will get our proportion, of course; or, we are supposed to get our share. Whether we will or not I do not know but I assume probably we shall.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes for the purpose of clarifying this question of our participation in the International Emergency Food Council and our authority to participate in it.

Mr. Marshall, of the Department of Agriculture, was before the committee, and this question was asked, and it was debated at length before the committee. On page 67 of the hearings we find this following language in connection with a statement of the history and authority for the United States participation in the International Emergency Food Council. I want to say at the outset that the International Emergency Food Council has no legislative authority and never was given the authority to dictate our policy. It operates only as an advisory group. The report says in part:

The authority for participation by the United States in the Combined Food Board and the International Emergency Food Council is derived from the inherent constitutional power of the President with respect to foreign affairs. It should be noted that the International Emergency Food Council merely makes recommendations based upon information mutually supplied by its members. As the Chief Executive of the Nation, it is clear that the President has authority to confer and consult with representatives of foreign powers for the purpose of discussing mutual problems and obtaining information necessary to him in the performance of his duties under the Constitution and Federal statutes. The United States Supreme Court said in *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation* (1936) (299 U. S. 304, 318, 319, 320) that the United States is vested with all the powers of government necessary to maintain an effective control of international relations, including, as a power inherently inseparable from the conception of nationality, the authority to make such international agreements as do not constitute treaties in the constitutional sense. The Court stated, moreover, that in the field of foreign affairs, "the President alone has the power to speak or listen as a representative of the Nation" and that although he makes treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate "he alone negotiates." It then affirmed the doctrine that in the field of international affairs, the President is the constitutional representative of the United States who manages our concerns with foreign powers.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Take additional time, because I would like to have the point clarified.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It was clarified fully in the minds of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It was not clarified, I may say, in my judgment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am sorry we have not been able to satisfy the gentleman on that. The gentleman brought this matter up in the hearings before the committee, and consequently we went into this matter very thoroughly and we thought we had satisfied him.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. We did not get any satisfaction in the hearing. I have gone over this matter with some attorneys, and they have advised me that there is no actual authority for this.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Whether they have authority or not, they merely act in an advisory capacity anyway. They have no status in the law except to advise with the President and the President is given authority under statutory law to ration and control the price of sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill. I am quite sure that in the debate that has preceded me it has been pointed out to the Members of this body that this bill was reported out to the House only after full and complete hearings; that in our hearings all of the representatives of the Government, the industry and all of its branches, with two exceptions, to my knowledge, supported this legislation.

I do not believe that it can be intelligently argued or questioned that at the present time this Nation has a serious sugar shortage. I have the honor and the privilege of representing one of the districts in the State of Louisiana which produces a large quantity of cane sugar. As all of you know, there are only two States in the Union which produce cane sugar, those being the States of Louisiana and Florida, and Louisiana by far producing the greatest amount.

Following the last World War we had the experience in this country of the price of sugar skyrocketing. For the moment it was a temporary benefit and advantage to the producers of the great State of Louisiana. But it ultimately resulted in the bankruptcy of practically all of the producers and all of the processors, and, representing a sugar district, I would be the last person in the world to advocate the removal of these controls at this time. I do feel, however, that the committee has been very wise in setting October 31, 1947, as the date for the final termination of these controls. That date was arrived at only after careful consideration by the members of the committee. It is significant because at that time the beet harvest is well under way and the cane harvest has also progressed so that by October 31, 1947, we will know not only what the production will be domestically in the cane and beet areas, but we will also know what the production will be offshore. In addition to that, it

accords to our local producers, whether they be in the cane or beet areas, what little advantage of cost or price increase may accrue as the result of the removal of controls.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Louisiana. I have listened with interest to the remarks of the gentleman about the termination date being the 31st day of October. In the event it turns out that the increase in the supply of sugar is not brought about by that date and it would be found desirable to continue controls beyond that particular time, does not the gentleman feel that some provision should be made in this bill because of the fact that at that time Congress will not be in session and could not act?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No; I do not think I would go along with the gentleman on that because if you refer to the hearings you will find I asked that very question of a number of witnesses who appeared before the committee and it is just as logical to argue that controls should be continued through 1948. By October 31, 1947, we will know definitely what our sugar supply is. So I feel that Congress wants to remove these controls, and the October 31 date is as logical a date as March 31, the date which has been suggested by some people.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend particularly the chairman of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who conducted these hearings in his usual fair way. All of the interests were permitted to be heard. I believe this bill comes before the House today by and large with the unanimous support of the committee.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. Why can we not end the controls on the 31st of this month?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. To end the controls on the 31st of this month, that is, the 31st of March, would be a very dangerous thing because we now know exactly what our sugar supply is for this year, 1947. If you will refer to the report on this bill you will find that we are several million tons short of the demand. If we remove controls next week, which would be the end of this month, we would have such a scramble for the available supplies of sugar that the housewives who need it most would not get it and the big industrial users who have the advantage of being able to bid up the price and who have the greatest funds would get all the sugar in the United States.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Does this bill make any provision for the housewives during the canning season?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think it does.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. What provision or section guarantees that any housewife will get additional sugar at the time she needs it most?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am not familiar with that particular section or provision, but I do know, first, that the allocation of sugar to the housewives has been increased for the next two quarters which is the period for which this bill extends controls. In addition, there was a great deal of testimony before the committee on that particular subject. However, the chairman of the committee or the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] might be better prepared to answer that particular inquiry.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there was no real shortage of sugar? And if there is no real shortage of sugar, why should we have these controls extended?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No; I did not say there was no real shortage of sugar. I said, in my opinion, on October 31, 1947, ample supplies of sugar would be in sight but at the present time when the 1947 and 1946 crops have been harvested or already in warehouses in this country and the allocations to foreign countries have been made, there is a shortage of sugar.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Did the gentleman read the statement in the Herald Tribune on March 7, 1947, which said that the Department of Agriculture stated there was no shortage of sugar?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No. But that was not the testimony of the Department before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I trust this bill will be adopted without amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that we should decontrol sugar as soon as we possibly can so that the law of supply and demand will again operate with this commodity. Of course the best time to decontrol is when we have an adequate supply. Our committee heard many witnesses who have studied the sugar situation all over the world for years and I listened attentively to their testimony. I feel the most valuable witness was our able colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] who during the last 12 months has visited every sugar-producing country in the world north of the Equator and probably knows as much about sugar as anyone in the House. His argument that October was the best time to remove controls carried great weight with me. He said that the crop from the continent of the United States would be available by that time and the Cuban crop would be available the following January to June. By announcing that time as termination date the beet-sugar growers of this country can go ahead this spring and summer and increase their acreage so that around that time of year we should have as good a supply as we are ever likely to get.

We put a provision in this bill to have the Department of Agriculture continue inventory controls until March 31, 1948. This was for the purpose of preventing large industrial users from stocking up before controls go off or right afterward.

I feel that whenever sugar is decontrolled the price will undoubtedly go up and our problem was to set the date of decontrol at the time of year when we would probably have the biggest supply available, in order to prevent too drastic a rise. Last year when jellies, jams, pastry, and so forth, were decontrolled the price, of course, went up and as a result the housewife is now paying between 25 and 30 cents a pound for the sugar going into those products when she buys them. The sugar-using products that the housewife buys account for about half the families' total consumption. So even if the housewife has to pay more for the sugar she buys from the grocer she will undoubtedly pay less for sugar used in the manufactured products and she will be in a position to put up her own jellies, jams, fruits, and so forth.

Generally speaking, the sooner we can have a free market and get the readjustment over with the better and the more likely we are to have an adequate sugar supply. For that reason I support this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I do not favor price or rationing control in a peacetime economy. This bill, however, in my opinion, is legislation to decontrol prices and rationing and, therefore, I support it.

This bill provides for the elimination of OPA, and for the first time we have set a definite, positive, fixed date upon which this commodity shall be decontrolled. That date has been fixed as of October 31, 1947, because at that time, we will know exactly what amount of sugar will be available for 1948. In addition, consumption will be at a minimum and production at a maximum. The possibility of speculation and exorbitant prices will be remote.

But the important thing, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, is the announced policy of decontrol.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the provisions of this bill contained on page 9, beginning with line 16, reading as follows:

Such personnel as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to be required may also be transferred temporarily to the Department of Agriculture pending termination in whole or in part of the powers, functions, and duties transferred by subsection (a) of this section.

I call your attention to the fact that as the bill is presently written it violates the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. This question is raised in a telegram that I think many of the Members have received from Col. John Thomas Taylor, legislative representative of the American Legion, which reads in part as follows:

Language of resolution would transfer employees from OPA to Department of Agriculture temporarily. Use of word "temporarily" destroys protection of veterans employed by OPA who would be transferred to Agriculture which protection contained in Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. Would appreciate your cooperation to ascertain that language

of resolution is amended so veterans' preference is preserved for each war veteran involved in transfer.

I discussed this matter with the Legal Division of the Civil Service Commission, and it is their opinion that the word "temporarily" in this resolution would empower the Department of Agriculture to eliminate the employees who were transferred from the Office of Price Administration without competition with employees now or hereafter employed in the Department of Agriculture. The belief, in which I concur, is that the above provision would nullify the following language of the Veterans' Preference Act, section 12:

And provided further, That when any or all of the functions of any agency are transferred to, or when any agency is replaced by, some other agency, or agencies, all preference employees in the function or functions transferred or in the agency which is replaced by some other agency shall first be transferred to the replacing agency, or agencies, for employment in positions for which they are qualified, before such agency, or agencies, shall appoint additional employees from any other source for such positions.

The intention of Congress in this provision of section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act was to insure the protection of the employees with veterans' preference who were transferred from one agency to another by virtue of the fact that the functions and duties of that particular agency were transferred to another agency. Under the present language the Department of Agriculture would be able to eliminate all of the employees transferred from the OPA, regardless of their veterans' preference or other rights as civil-service employees.

When the proper time comes I shall offer an amendment to protect the veterans' preference rights under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. I have prepared an amendment which will, at the end of this section, line 23 on page 9, add these words:

Provided, That nothing in this section shall in any wise be construed to violate any of the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

I think the members of this committee are as anxious to see that veterans' rights are protected as they were when they passed the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. I trust that when the time comes for the consideration of this amendment I may secure the unanimous approval of this committee. I should also add that this matter was discussed in a meeting of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It was agreed by the members present that an amendment should be submitted to this legislation to provide for proper protection of veterans' rights under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of this committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might state that it was not the intent of the committee or any member of the committee that I know of, to in any manner interfere with the civil-service status of any em-

ployee. The word "temporary" was used solely in respect to the length of his employment in that particular department. It was explanatory of the fact that we were setting up these controls temporarily and that did not change in any manner the status of the individual.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

If there is any question about it, I make the suggestion that the gentleman broaden the language of his amendment to include the assertion that this language shall in no manner affect the civil-service status of any employee so transferred, because I am afraid if we say it shall not change the veteran's preference status, by saying that, we might indicate we are changing the status of other employees in other respects.

Mr. REES. To do that you could strike out the word "temporarily."

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, no; because we do not want those employees transferred permanently to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. REES. I can see what is in the gentleman's mind. I believe my first proposal is the proper one to follow.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We want to make it clear that the status is not changed so long as they are temporarily working for the Secretary of Agriculture, but when he gets through with them they may either be transferred back to the OPA, if OPA is in existence, or transferred to other agencies, or, under the Civil Service rules and regulations, I presume they could be transferred permanently to the Department of Agriculture. But under the provisions of this law they cannot be transferred permanently to the Department of Agriculture. We save the Civil Service Commission in any prerogatives or rights that they may have under the Civil Service law to protect, in full, the status of civil-service employees. This word "temporarily" has nothing whatsoever to do with the status of the employee. It has to do with the length of his employment.

Mr. REES. The thing in which I am deeply interested is this, that when a veteran is transferred under the terms of this measure to the Department of Agriculture, that veteran should have the right, as is required under the Veterans' Preference Act, to compete with any other employee in the Department of Agriculture holding a similar position, in the event of reduction in force. He should have the right of veterans' preference preserved if he is transferred to the Department of Agriculture. You should not hold him out separate from other groups.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Should a veteran who is now working in OPA have the right, in his present status, to compete with those in the Department of Agriculture, in a comparable status?

Mr. REES. As an employee in the Department of Agriculture, certainly he

should have that right. He becomes an employee of the Department of Agriculture and has such rights as accrue to him as an employee of that Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that every man in this Congress today desires to bring about decontrol of sugar as soon as it is safe and proper to do so.

I represent probably the largest sugar-producing area in this country. The question to my mind is when should this be done. My area of south Louisiana also produces an enormous amount of rice. We were very much chagrined when the President continued control on rice and sugar. We thought we were being discriminated against. But after deliberation and thought, it was inevitable that we come to the conclusion that sugar controls should continue, because of the short supply that existed. We do not want a repetition of what occurred after the last war, where every sugar planter, processor, and refiner was virtually bankrupt, and failures were wholesale. We do not want prices to skyrocket like they did during that period. But we do want sugar controls to go off as quickly as possible.

The October 31 date as written in the bill by the committee to my mind is a very reasonable and logical one.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I am seeking information only, and I may say to the gentleman that I am not a member of his committee. We in my section of Ohio are very much interested in the peach crop. We are consumers of peach crop, and I am wondering if additional rations for canning purposes are being considered.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I am not a member of the committee either, I may say to the gentleman from Ohio, but I am informed that such testimony was given before the committee. I was not present myself and cannot testify.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to my distinguished colleague that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Judiciary Committee has been hearing evidence under the Second War Powers Act. That has been completed. The gentleman mentioned something about rationing a little while ago. We had a very distinguished gentleman who testified before our committee and from the statements he made there seemed to be no necessity for continuing rice under the controls it has been held under heretofore. I would like to have the gentleman give an explanation on that subject if he will.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I think that is a correct statement, because production of rice in the United States today is 50 percent more than its normal consumption and export to its normal markets

such as Puerto Rico and Cuba. The only justification for rice control at the present time in my opinion is possibly export control, but not domestic control, because such domestic control would prevent a maximum development of such markets.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman feel that it is necessary that the export control be continued?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Yes; I do, and that seems to be the unanimous opinion of the producers, processors, and millers of rice in my section of the country.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The same question was directed to the gentleman that was directed to me a few moments ago in my remarks about sugar for the housewife. If the gentleman will refer to page 8 of the committee report he will note that the sugar ration for this year, 1947, has been increased approximately 10 pounds per person over what it was last year, which means approximately 30 or 40 pounds per family.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I think that is correct. It simply shows that sugar supplies are improving day by day in this country.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. Does the gentleman think we would have more or less sugar if we did not pass this bill?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I do not believe the question of control or decontrol would either increase or decrease production. There is no incentive situation involved in this decontrol measure; but it will do this, it will put back the operations to a normally competitive market which I think will give a better flow of the sugar which is available.

Mr. ROBSION. That will be after October.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. After October 31, 1947.

Mr. ROBSION. Would the provisions of this bill permit any greater quantity of sugar to be shipped to foreign countries?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. No; it would not, and as a matter of fact none of our domestically produced sugars have ever been shipped to foreign countries.

If I may continue, I am gratified to see the committee bring out this bill decontrolling sugar as of October 31. Without wishing to be presumptive, it carries with it the major provisions which were contained in House Joint Resolution 115, which I introduced earlier. In my bill there was provision that sugar be decontrolled on October 31 and it also contained inventory controls, the transfer of powers to the Secretary of Agriculture, and a provision allowing new users to participate in sugar supplies.

The question of timing is paramount and important in the question of the decontrol of sugar, and it is proper that October should be that date because October is the statistical date that is employed and has always been employed in the sugar markets. It is also the date when the annual estimates of sugar are established and determined. It is the

date when the estimates as to beet and cane sugars from Louisiana, Florida beet areas, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Hawaii are determined. It would be the most ridiculous thing in the world to me to see sugar decontrolled at any other date than September or October, because if you carry it on beyond the year it would only mean this: The Louisiana people who produce sugar and who market their sugar from November on would certainly retain their sugar and not put it on the market, with the result that it would contribute to a short supply. The same would result from other areas who normally market before such date. The reasonable time to decontrol this sugar is before your producers put their sugars on the market, so that the legitimate increase, should any result at the end of October, would go to those people who are entitled to those increases, and they are the producers of sugar and not the speculators. We know that our anticipated consumption for 1948 will be approximately 8,000,000 short tons of sugar. We estimate the production for a similar period, from the mainland and beet areas, will be 2,200,000 tons; from Hawaii, approximately 800,000 tons; from Puerto Rico, 1,000,000 tons; and from Cuba, 5,500,000 tons—or a total of 9,500,000 tons.

Now, all of this sugar in the past, historically, belonged to the United States, and we used such sugars. Today, however, part of the Cuban crop becomes a part of the international arrangement. But the fact still remains that the anticipated production of sugar is going to be substantially larger than it has been in the past. There is an element of risk involved in the decontrol of sugar, and that element exists today; it will exist in October, it will exist in March, and it will exist next October.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. There is always going to be an element of risk involved in the decontrol of sugar, and we might as well understand that there may be and probably will be an increase in the price of sugar. But I believe that after a very short time it will moderate itself and it will go back to normalcy, and it is only reasonable and proper that when the production is about equal to the requirements, that the great sugar industry in this country should have an opportunity to readjust itself in times like these, so that when hard times come, when production comes, they will have adjusted themselves into a normal market and will be in a better position to meet those problems.

Certainly, if sugar goes up a little bit, and I think it will, that is not unreasonable, because sugar today and always has been the cheapest commodity on the American market. You are paying about 9 cents for sugar today, and in comparison it has gone up very, very little to what other commodities have. Actually you could not produce sugar in this country under the market prices if it were not for the subsidies that are provided for by this Government.

So, I say that October 31 is the date on which sugar should be decontrolled. The other body has a bill which provides for the decontrol of sugar after March 31. That bill, I understand, will be taken up today or tomorrow. Certainly, I have no criticism of that but I do hope that they will see the situation as the House will and that they will join with us in meeting the date of October 31.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman, coming from a large sugar-producing area, is thoroughly familiar with the sugar situation. Does he believe that the production situation will be any different on October 31 than it will be on March 31?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. The gentleman is perfectly correct. There will be no difference. There can be no difference, because the production period is determined as of October 31. The situation, insofar as greater or lesser supplies are concerned, should change at all between the period of October 31 and March 31 of the following year.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Do I understand that the fixing of the date as of October 31 is predicated on a belief that the sugar situation, the supply situation at that time, will be substantially ample to take care of our requirements?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That is the general proposition. It is the estimate of anticipated production on that date.

Mr. HARDY. That anticipation is based on current production estimates?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. Is it not within the realm of possibility that there might be a serious curtailment in our production between now and October 31?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That is possible as to any commodity. There is an element of risk.

Mr. HARDY. That was my point. That being the case, how long prior to October 31 would it be possible to determine whether on October 31 we might be faced with a serious shortage?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That could be determined say 15 days previous, October 15.

Mr. HARDY. In such event, what action can the gentleman recommend?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That is the risk that is involved in any such operation as this.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is it not a fact that the same risk would be taken if you adopted March 31, 1948?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. So that you could make a case for continuing control of sugar.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. There is no doubt about that. You would be con-

stantly confronted with the same uncertainties that exist as of that date.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Suppose on the 15th day of March 1948 Cuba, an independent republic, announces to the United States that it does not propose to harvest any more sugarcane? What are you going to do on March 31, 1948? I submit to those who argue that date.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. The price would go sky high and you would have little chance of supplying our requirements.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That could happen any time under a free economy?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Absolutely.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to compliment this splendid committee for bringing in this bill.

Listening to the debate, I could not help but think about the efforts this committee made a year ago in bringing in their price-control bill, which later was vetoed by the President, because the principle involved here today is, as far as sugar is concerned, just one example of what this committee tried to do as far as all the many articles that were under control at the time. Therefore, I think this is an admission here among ourselves that we are going to take sugar and do the same thing as we tried to do in the bill of a year ago.

The reason I asked for this time, Mr. Chairman, is to clarify once more exactly what is going to happen in the conservation of one of our greatest foods. Great losses of a splendid food is taking place at this time. I am speaking of dried skim milk. I do not want to take your time to describe it any more than to say that it has something over 35 percent digestible animal protein. It is the cheapest food in the world today. Until 1935 its production for animal use and human use was not kept separately. One of the most constructive pieces of food conservation that took place during this war took place in the diversion of this dried skim milk from animal feeding to human use. In fact, by 1946, there were only 15,000,000 pounds going into animal feeding. The chances are a large part of that 15,000,000 pounds may have been spoiled during the process and might not have been fit for human consumption. Last year we produced 663,000,000 pounds of this wonderful product.

There has been plenty of criticism because no more effort was made to conserve the food value of the millions of bushels of potatoes that were wasted. Many people feel that more effort should have been made to recapture the food in this potato crop and divert those potatoes to human consumption. Facing, as we do today, a large increase in the production of certain manufactured dairy products, which means an increase in the production of this powdered skim milk, we are going to face throughout the next few months a more serious problem than we ever had before. What I

am addressing myself to is the importance of providing sugar so that we can conserve as large a quantity as possible of this skim milk that is going down the drain in the thousands of tons and is liable to go from now on during the flush season.

So that we may have it right in the record, once and for all, may I ask the distinguished chairman if he feels in his own heart and in his own mind that this skim milk is having the consideration that it should have, and if he feels that every effort will be made to conserve this great food?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the intent of the committee in this legislation is carried out, that matter would get all of the consideration which it deserves, taking into account its importance in relation to the over-all program. We found it rather difficult in laying out this program to set aside any certain percentage of our sugar stock for any particular use. As I said, we must give the administration of this law to somebody, and we thought if it was given to the Secretary of Agriculture he would give more sympathetic consideration to the use of sugar for the preservation of foods than at present. So we have made it very clear. It is the intent of the committee, and we should make it clear now that it is the intent of the Congress, that in the allocation of sugar in respect to so-called hardship cases or the cases of new users, that the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out the provisions shall make reasonable provision for meeting the needs of users of sugar in case of hardship. You note we use the word "shall" which means that it is mandatory.

Then we stress the fact that we intend he shall make larger quantities available for the preservation of milk, including cases where sugar is needed to avoid the wastage of milk or other food products. We mention milk here specifically along with other food products, giving emphasis to the necessity for the allocation of sugar to prevent the spoiling of millions of gallons of food in the form of milk which might otherwise be preserved for our use and the use of people all over the world.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I think every one of us realizes that with the huge appropriation being made in connection with our food program in our country and all over the world we must be careful that we recapture and preserve all the food that we produce rather than come to Congress for a \$100,000,000 for this and a \$100,000,000 for that in the name of agriculture. At least, we ought to make some concerted constructive effort to conserve the food that is produced and not allow it to be continually wasted.

Mr. ROBSION. The gentleman who is addressing the House is a very able member of the great Committee on Agriculture, and as I understand it he favors this bill. Does the gentleman favor the bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBSION. In what way will that help the American housewife or other consumers of sugar?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It can be made to help the housewife. I do not know of any way that we can properly get out from under these controls except gradually as we voted to do a year ago. That is the reason why we must submit to certain controls and must submit to a control over exports for a while longer.

Mr. ROBSION. And under this bill the controls are extended to October 31.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. By October 31 we should know pretty well what the sugar production of this country is going to be. We should have a pretty good idea of it.

Mr. ROBSION. The gentleman is telling us that this bill is necessary and essential in the interest of the American housewives and canners and other consumers of sugar?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am. I think if it is properly handled and if the sugar is used for the right purpose, it is the very best measure that we can have at the present time.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has correctly observed that by October 31 we will know the production of sugar in the United States for this current calendar crop year. Likewise, we will know the production in Europe and all the sugar-beet fields in the world by October 31.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We will also know what Cuba will have produced from the cane now going to the mills and thus settle this question of the 654,000 additional tons which it was announced in this country it is expected that the Cuban sugar production will be over and above all estimates previously made in the last 60 days by the Government.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. It has long been recognized that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is one of the Nation's greatest sugar authorities. I am pleased to find he is in support of this legislation.

The following data and comments are submitted at this point.

DRIED SKIM MILK

Mr. Chairman, dried skim milk is a food product that never has and apparently is not now sufficiently appreciated. This product has a content of 35.6 percent of good digestible animal protein.

When one realizes that meat has but from 15 to 20 percent digestible protein, it is apparent why every effort should be made to save every pound of dried skim milk and use it for human consumption.

The Agriculture Department recently placed a floor price of 10 cents per pound on the product. Even the OPA in its wisdom provided a 14½ cents per pound ceiling price.

Skim milk plus millions of bushels of wasted potatoes could have been used for concentrated soups. Today additional sugar should be allocated so that skim milk could be canned in the form of condensed sweetened skim.

Why waste foods after they have been produced. Why appropriate millions to encourage additional food production if

our agencies are not conserving and processing the good foods already produced.

The following is a table showing both the amounts of dried skim produced and the diversion of dried skim from animal feed to human food.

Nonfat dry milk solids production, United States, 1918-46

[1,000 lbs.]

Year	Spray, human	Roller, human	Total, human food	Dry skim, animal feed	Total, human and animal
1918					26,202
1919					34,945
1920					41,893
1921					38,546
1922					40,617
1923					62,251
1924					69,219
1925					73,317
1926					91,718
1927					118,123
1928					147,996
1929					207,579
1930					260,675
1931					261,938
1932					270,194
1933					288,114
1934					294,935
1935			187,531	109,975	297,506
1936			223,827	125,723	349,550
1937			244,511	127,692	372,203
1938			289,121	160,170	449,291
1939			267,860	140,520	408,380
1940			321,843	159,962	481,805
1941			366,455	110,042	476,497
1942			565,414	61,148	626,562
1943	245,596	264,024	509,620	24,279	533,899
1944	266,448	316,464	582,912	16,407	599,319
1945	298,741	345,004	643,745	17,602	661,347
1946	351,800	286,460	638,260	15,525	653,785

¹ Preliminary enumeration.

² Estimates, subject to revision.

Official table from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The product is used in the baking industry and for the manufacture of ice cream and candy. In condensed form as well as in dried form the product has been combined with cream and reconstituted and used as fluid milk in many areas during the past few years.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to support House Joint Resolution 146 and in doing so wish to compliment the House Banking and Currency Committee for an honest effort to solve the sugar problem.

There is no issue more confused or more difficult to understand than the scarcity of sugar.

During the past week end, when talking to an industrial sugar user in Altoona, Pa., he convinced me that practically everyone but the American people can obtain an adequate supply of sugar. He read a letter that he received from a broker in New York City containing the following statements:

How are you fixed up on cocoa butter, milk chocolate in bales, or Brazilian bitter chocolate in bags or cases?

Then he read this statement:

Imports of sugar candy and confections from all countries to the United States rose from 1,166,000 pounds in 1942 to 62,575,000 pounds in 1945.

He concluded his discussion by informing me that during a recent visit to the

post office he was told that a 5-pound package of American granulated sugar that a resident of Sweden sent to a relative here in the United States, was awaiting delivery until the necessary ration stamps could be given to the Post Office Department. In other words, American-processed sugar sent to Sweden was returned to the United States to a relative.

Foreign manufacturers of cocoa butter and milk chocolate requiring sugar seem to have no difficulty in producing chocolate containing sugar. In general, foreign manufacturers have no difficulty in making sugar candy and confections and sending them to the United States. Foreign citizens have no trouble getting sugar from the United States and then returning it to relatives in this country. Is it any wonder the American people are bewildered and confused?

American housewives have been too patient and have accepted so many flimsy excuses that it is time we have an honest allocation of sugar supplies with the insistence that the United States receive an adequate amount of sugar for the needs of the American people.

The House Committee on Banking and Currency is to be commended for establishing a date upon which sugar controls will terminate because until we get the Government out of the hair of the American people we are going to continue to be faced with confusion and chaos in handling the supply of sugar in the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this minute in order to ask the chairman of the committee if he thinks it is intended that the hardship provision in the bill is intended to provide relief for retailers for their inventory to meet the impact of the increase in the stamp ration from 5 pounds to 10 pounds.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If there are any hardships created by increasing the value of the sugar stamp to the retail grocer, it is my opinion that the Secretary of Agriculture will have to give consideration to it, under the language of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes to answer the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. At the time of the hearings the statement was made that we feel should be clarified so that the agency may know just how far it should go and what it is required to do insofar as setting up new businesses is concerned. Then it says particularly so since the effect of the new user's provision would be to increase the available supply of sugar for the industrial users. I would like to include the housewives and everyone who uses sugar in that provision concerning new users, to have that clarified enough to let the housewives

and industrial users know whether they are going to be deprived of sugar which they previously had.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not think there should be any question about this. This will be enough with respect to that. In making available sugar for new users, the Secretary of Agriculture is not limited by too rigid standards or even suggestions in the act, except that we do compel him to make available some sugar for new users. It may be assumed that if it develops that the Secretary should make available, for example, 10 percent of any increase to new industrial users, then the present industrial and commercial users, will have to have 10 percent taken from the increase. So that if there is an increase of 15 percent to the industrial user, as I believe it is contemplated, and it develops that the new users must have 10 percent of that increase, then the new industrial and commercial users will have 10 percent of the increase deducted from the 15 percent. I have gone a long way around to explain the situation but I think that would inevitably happen, but it would not be taken from the allocation which they have at the present time. It would be taken from the increase over any allocation they now have.

Mr. OWENS. That makes it very plain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, although I do not like continued governmental controls and hope they can and will be eliminated just as rapidly as is consistent with safety, I have become convinced that the temporary continuance of control over the supply of sugar is necessary in order to give the housewives of this country something like an adequate supply at a reasonable price. My fear is that if we do not support this measure we will find in short order that all our sugar will be gobbled up by industrial users or at least its price will be inflated by the volume consumers to such a point that the housewives cannot buy it or will have to pay a price way out of all reason. With some reluctance therefore I plan to support this legislation.

I do want to ask a question of the distinguished chairman, however, with reference to the very last paragraph of the bill because I think it is not desirable, unless absolutely necessary, to extend governmental control over anything that is not now covered. In the first place, are these liquid sugar, sirups, and molasses and sugar-containing products mentioned in this paragraph now covered by controls, and if they are not, what is the reason for bringing those allied products under this bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. They are covered at the present time. I suggest that the gentleman not to be confused by the use of the word "saccharin" in line 3. That is not the saccharin that you buy in a drugstore in bottles, which is not made from these products

Mr. KEATING. I have been informed by certain industrial users in my district that the present price control is only over sugar derived from sugar cane and sugar beets. Is that in error?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We cannot add new products under the language of the bill. We could not bring other commodities under control which were not under control on February 18, 1947, which is an arbitrary date. On page 6, if the gentleman will refer to his work copy of House Joint Resolution 146, we provide:

That the power contained herein shall not be deemed (1) to permit the allocation or rationing of any product (other than the allocation of such product imported or brought into the continental United States) unless a regulation providing for allocation or rationing thereof was in effect on February 18, 1947.

So this bill could not be interpreted as broadening any authority which was not in operation on February 18, 1947, in respect to use, rationing and price control which existed on that date.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN].

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, for having called attention to the word "temporarily" on page 9, line 18, and to ask that this committee give favorable consideration to the amendment which I understand the gentleman from Kansas intends to offer.

I want you to know that our committee heard both sides of this question. We came to the conclusion that we should be concerned with the protection of the veterans who are going to be involved by reason of transfer to the Department of Agriculture. I think everyone here appreciates that these men should have the same standing as those presently employed by the Department of Agriculture when it comes to be necessary to reduce the force. We understand that this whole provision of the extension of controls is temporary. We do not believe those men should be sacrificed by the inadvertent use of this unfortunate word "temporarily." I do hope that favorable consideration will be given to the amendment when it is offered.

Unless the word "temporarily" is eliminated from this bill a serious injustice may be done to a large number of veterans who are transferred as a result of the passage of this act. I feel that we should carry out the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act. I am glad the American Legion and other veterans' organizations were alert and brought this to the attention of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise primarily for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a few questions.

Mr. Chairman, I think the sugar rationing program created more resentment among the American housewives than any program ever inaugurated. Take the situation down in my district. During the canning season the housewife could go to any country store and find plenty of soft drinks, plenty of candy, and yet she could not find the sugar to can the fruit that was going to waste.

I believe some provision should be made to give American housewives sufficient sugar to can her fruits and berries. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if provision (b) on page 7 providing for hardship cases would take care of the American housewives during the canning season?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If there were going to be food wastage at that time, as there of course would be if she were not given reasonably adequate supplies, then I think under the language of the bill and the interpretation expressed in the report, the Secretary of Agriculture would have to give consideration to those cases as hardship cases. The language we have used in the committee report would indicate our intent in that respect.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It would indicate the intent of Congress to give additional sugar to the American housewives during the canning season provided under the allotments made to them, they could not obtain sufficient sugar to can their fruits and vegetables to tide them over to the next canning season.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Under the language of the bill and under the language in the committee report, the Secretary of Agriculture must give reasonable consideration to the alleviation of those cases if otherwise there is likely to be a wastage of food products.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. There was a tremendous wastage of food products during the last canning season, I think, not only in my district, but all over the country. A lot of food went to waste due to the fact that the housewife could not get the sugar with which to can.

I would like to ask the ranking minority member if the interpretation given by the chairman is his interpretation of the language.

Mr. SPENCE. I think it is a reasonable interpretation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the Members of the House that I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee a few questions, and preliminarily to asking those questions may I say that subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary has been holding hearings on the Second War Powers Act, which includes also title III of that act which relates to allocations and priorities under which practically all of this sugar rationing and allocations has been handled. At this moment, and before we complete the executive sessions of that committee, and in rewriting whatever will be rewritten with

respect to the Second War Powers Act I would like to ask the chairman of the committee two or three questions, if I may have the gentleman's attention at this time.

I note under the bill which is before the House, Mr. Chairman, that it provides that notwithstanding any other provisions of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942 and the amendments thereto, and title XIV of the Second War Powers Act of 1942, are eliminated, apparently, by this bill. The question now comes under title III of the Second War Powers Act as to whether or not that title should be extended insofar as allocations and priorities are concerned with respect to sugar or whether or not this pending bill, if passed, will fully cover and take care of everything with respect to the allocation of sugar with the present shortage? I would like to have a definite answer on that subject, if I may.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Upon the effective date of this bill, all the powers necessary to ration sugar will be in effect, because this bill continues the provisions of title III and title IV of the Second War Powers Act of 1942, insofar as they relate to sugar. Therefore, since the bill would continue the sugar-rationing-authority provisions of title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942 it would not be necessary to continue them by other legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. In other words, as I understand, if this pending bill is passed it will be wholly unnecessary for any extension under the Second War Powers Act, or the allocations provided thereunder with respect to sugar; is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It would not only be unnecessary, it would be quite redundant.

Mr. SPRINGER. Another question, if I may be permitted. As I understand, with the passage of this act, it will not interfere in any way with the allocation of sugar under rationing stamp 11; that is, those who have possession of the stamp will be entitled to receive 10 pounds of sugar rather than 5 pounds of sugar, and this act will not tend to affect that allocation in any way whatever. That notwithstanding the provisions of the pending bill the housewives will be entitled to receive 10 pounds of sugar on stamp No. 11, and those following.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is my understanding. As a matter of fact, we hope it will not be necessary to print any more stamps. The commitments we have made are transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to thank the chairman for that information and those answers. This information will be very helpful to subcommittee No. 4 of the Judiciary Committee. What we desire, and that which I seek to secure, is an ample allocation of sugar for household use throughout our country and an ample amount of sugar for canning purposes. We must aid in saving the fruit for use in every home in our Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] spoke on the rule the other day he said:

I am pleased because some of the gentlemen who are members of this committee and others used to charge that all of the legislation enacted by the so-called New Deal is bad and vicious.

Then he expressed his pleasure over the fact that controls on sugar were being continued.

Controls on sugar may be continued, but there is certainly no pleasure in it and it is not being done because the wartime controls were a good thing. We are having sugar trouble today because of the sugar policy followed by this Government over the last 25 or 30 years. It is because we have not produced sufficient sugar domestically. Whenever we are dependent upon foreign producers for a greater portion of any commodity we will be in trouble in time of national emergency and in time of war.

Few people realize that before the war an American farmer who wanted to produce sugar beets, even though his land was adapted to it, could not get that right. That situation still exists so far as long-range planning is concerned. Our sugar troubles began a long time ago. The situation we are facing today started back when the quota on Philippine sugar was removed in the passage of the Underwood tariff. Up until that time a limit of 400,000 tons on the importation of sugar from the Philippines had been maintained. It was taken off in the Underwood tariff. American Spanish, English, and Dutch capital then moved into the Philippines. The islands became a one-crop economy, perhaps to their hurt. The imports into this country continued until they exceeded 1,000,000 tons. In the meantime the American sugar industry got in a bad way, it was chaotic. They came to the Congress and asked for relief, and we had the Jones-Costigan Act, and later on the Sugar Act under which we are now operating, which put a quota on the production of sugar. Congress said that American farmers could have only a small portion of the sugar market in the United States. We were in that sort of an economy and subject to that sort of control when the war came along. Henry Wallace went up and down the country advocating the discontinuance of our domestic sugar industry.

The people in the territory that I have the honor to represent want to produce more sugar. They have land and water adapted to it. We could easily supply sugar beets for four or five more sugar factories, but the Sugar Act must be removed first.

This Congress in the last session passed the Philippines Trade Act. We established a precedent and said that the Philippine Islands shall have in the post-war future the same share of our domestic market as they had before. This means that all the other off-shore producers, whether Cuba, Puerto Rico, South America, or other foreign countries, are going to insist that they be not cut down.

It means a program of only a small portion of our sugar being produced in the continental United States. It is wrong and unwise.

There is something that can be done so we will not always be threatened with a sugar shortage and high prices, and I hope the Committee on Agriculture can keep it in mind when they revise the Sugar Act. We should limit these off-shore producers of sugar to the number of tons of sugar that they produced for us in the prewar days. I would go further, but we should limit them that much at least. This means that any additional sugar that we need here by reason of increased per capita consumption should be produced by the American beet and cane producers. It means also that the sugar needed to feed our increased population should be produced here at home. The population has increased from 120,000,000 at the time this program was formulated to approximately 140,000,000 at the present time. You are facing a sugar problem today because we have not been self-sufficient in regard to sugar.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I was very much interested in what the gentleman said particularly in the beginning of his statement. I call the gentleman's attention to the statement I made awhile ago, that this is not a sugar control bill, it is a bill to de-control sugar. The timing element is important.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; but when you de-control under this bill you still have the Sugar Act and you still have the Philippine trade bill. You gentlemen who served in the last Congress will recall how the Committee on Ways and Means voted to cut the quota for producers of sugar in the Philippines. This would have helped our domestic producers of sugar and it would have helped the Philippines by preventing their return to a one-crop economy. An attack was made on that action. Editorials were published, and the State Department carried on a campaign, and that action was later reversed.

We have started off again on a program of depending on offshore producers for our sugar. The answer to our sugar problem is more production of sugar within the continental limits of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, with millions and millions of people starving throughout the world, why should rich Uncle Sam go into the markets of the world and buy any food and bring it here? We can best serve the world from an altruistic standpoint by producing our own food. The American market belongs to the American farmer. The Committee on Agriculture should write a sugar program that will provide for the maximum domestic production of sugar. Our increased production of sugar beets in the irrigated West will be welcomed and in the interests of the country.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, we have had a clear-cut demonstration here this afternoon of how the President of

the United States did relieve this body of mental and perhaps emotional stress and debate amongst ourselves when the President removed controls on numerous things without us having to pass upon them here on the floor of the House, whether it be meat, butter, or anything else. If we had had to pass on those controls, we would have had the same kind of debate with respect to any particular commodity as we have had here on sugar this afternoon. So we can be thankful to the President of the United States because on his own initiative he removed certain controls following the November 5 election and thus took such matters out of the hands of this body.

Secondly, I am going to say something very bluntly here. I am going to talk to you as politicians, Democrats and Republicans. Do you want to decontrol sugar in an election year, a Presidential election year, on March 31 or June 30 or October 31? If you do, go ahead and do it. I am not going to vote for that kind of proposition. That is just about as blunt as I can say it. Many people would say, "That bird is certainly a low-down politician of the first order." I am just being practical about this and realistic about it.

Vote to decontrol sugar on March 31, 1948, and assuming your arguments here are reasonably correct in that the price of sugar is going to rapidly advance, then go home next spring and summer and face the housewives of this country and let them pull the hair out of your head if you have any left—I do not have much left for them to pull. You just try that. Vote to decontrol sugar on March 31, 1948, at the beginning of the heavy sugar consumer period of the year 1948 and as the crops are vanishing on the market and you will take the most encouraging step you ever took in your life to send sugar to 25 or 35 cents a pound, which the housewives of this country will probably have to pay. The time of decontrolling of any commodity is just as important as the matter of decontrol itself. Get that fixed in your minds. If you want to set the natural forces of an economy against the spirit of inflation and speculation, then decontrol as of the date the heavy consuming is over and as of the date the heavy production comes into the market. That is exactly the date selected by this committee, namely, October 31, 1947, and which date I favor.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. In just a moment. If you are not going to decontrol October 31, 1947, I am telling you now you had better not decontrol until 1949. How many of you want to keep controls on sugar until 1949? That is as plain as I can say it.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. What assurance can the gentleman give us that the other body will accept the date you have mentioned?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not responsible for the other body, and in no way do I speak for them. I simply point this out: If you will send to the document room, you will get the report of

the committee in the other body, in which they have reported a bill. I have a copy of it before me, Senate Joint Resolution 58. In that they set March 31, 1948, as decontrol period. Why they set it at that date God only knows. I am not speaking politically in that statement. I am speaking because every natural economic argument that can possibly be brought up by anybody—and I will challenge anybody on it—is against decontrol as of March 31. Let me show you why.

Mr. BANTA. That would be any year?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That would be any year. Here is the gentleman from California, or Oregon, or Washington, where sugar is produced; you put control on his farmers who start harvesting their sugar in July or August, and you hold that control until March 31, until they have sold all of their sugar; what assurance do you think he has got of coming back to Congress after a situation like that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When is your heavy consuming period on sugar? It runs from about April 1 until about November 1. That is when the people are drawing sugar for every use imaginable in this country in the biggest volume they can get their hands on.

What do you can after November 1, what do you preserve after November 1 of any consequence? Most of your candy for the Christmas trade has been made at that time and is moving into the channels of trade for Christmas distribution. Along about this time, March 15, you are at the lowest consuming period. Then about April 1 you are approaching the beginning of the heavy consuming period. November to April 1 is your low consumption. When do the sugar stocks go onto the market? They come onto the market starting in California in late August or September, and they move across toward the Atlantic seaboard—I am speaking of domestic sugar now—they come into the eastern area, and your heavy domestic continental production comes on in October, November, and December. Before those stocks are exhausted sugars begin to sweep in from Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. You are meshing the heavy flow with the low consumption, which says to the speculator, "You had better go slow on speculation, because you may have to carry that sugar a long time, with markets operating as they do sometimes." Your banker may call you up and say to you, "You had better unload some of that sugar. The price might break." The Federal Reserve Board says to the banks, "Do not supply too many credits for speculative loans at this particular time." So October 31 is the date you mesh your low consumption with high production, and dampen down the speculative spirits of your people. Now, go to March 31 again. Your low-consumption period is about past. You are moving into the high-consuming period. Your heavy production is coming to a close. Who

holds the sugar, primarily, for the next 5 or 6 months? Cuba. Cuba can wring the purse strings of every housewife in this country during the period April 1 until September or October, when beet sugar is in heavy supply. If you want to go through a summer like that next year, go ahead and do it, but you remember I told you you had better not do it.

Now, this bill says to the people of this country, "Put your sugar house in order." These controls go off next October 31. You will undoubtedly get one from the other body which says March 31. You will have to compromise somewhere or you will have to stand pat, so you had better look out for a roll call on this proposition and you had better make up your mind what you are going to do before you start voting. The committee report from the other body has put in some very strong language. Unless you know sugar you may get your feet tangled up in the bullrushes and get some burs under your arm too. You have got every housewife in the United States wondering what you are going to do about these sugar controls. If I had my way about it as sugar administrator, I would take the tonnage of sugar that is allocated to the United States and I would say to the housewives of this country, "You are going to have a certain percentage of that." I would be quite liberal in that. Having decided the percentages which the housewives are going to get, I would allocate the balance of it to manufacturing consumers of this country and I would not confer a proprietary right on any fellow, it does not make any difference what his historical background is. Mr. A has as much right to operate a business as Mr. B. I would not use the force of the Federal Government to set up Mr. B in business and confer on him any proprietary right exclusive of all of the others.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. What the gentleman is saying, boiled down to one sentence, is that we had better pass this bill and not monkey with something the outcome of which we cannot foresee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes. And I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, in view of all the circumstances, I favor the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, my interpretation of this bill is that it will give the Secretary of Agriculture an opportunity to show that he is fair-minded in the adoption of a policy which should give the American housewife more sugar. On several occasions when he came before our committee he indicated that more sugar would be available this year. Of course, I went on record long ago as wanting a larger ration of sugar for everybody. I,

for one, hope that he makes good his pledge in allowing the average housewife more sugar. Every family ought to have at least 25 pounds more right off the bat.

If there was ever an instance of wastage of food it is certainly at the present time when the farmers and the rank and file of city folks are not able to utilize the food they have been able to gather and purchase by preserving it and do a number of different things with it for which sugar is vitally necessary. I, for one, hope the Department of Agriculture will be more fair in allocating and allotting sugar than the agencies which have been empowered with that duty heretofore. That is the reason I am going along with this legislation today.

Just after the last election a friend of mine of long standing took me by the lapel and said: "This Congress has an opportunity to satisfy and satiate the people of America in correcting this No. 1 fiasco that has been foisted upon the American people—the regulation of sugar."

As elected officials we have the chance now to correct this situation. Give the housewife more sugar and we will all be a lot happier.

There are some who feel this bill leaves too much control of sugar in Government hands. Actually there is just enough to keep big buyers from cornering all our sugar supply, at the same time giving the average civilian and the small businessman a chance to obtain an adequate amount.

The responsibility now rests upon the Secretary of Agriculture. He can give the American people a break if he wants to by assuring us all a fairer distribution of one of the most necessary of all food items—sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I sought this time to ask for some information from the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The conclusion of the committee includes the following statement on page 10 of the committee report:

The committee has further recommended that the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of the allocation program shall provide for the needs of hardship cases, and for the needs of new users and those having no base-period history. It feels that with the increased sugar available during 1947, over 1946, for industrial users that the reasonable needs of new users, and the reasonable relief of hardship cases including provision of sugar to prevent the wastage of mill and other food products, must be provided for by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Iowa City, Iowa, is the home of the State University of Iowa. It is a city of approximately 18,000 to 20,000 people. The university enrollment has leaped to more than 10,000 students this year and will go even higher next year, whereas the attendance heretofore has been between 6,000 and 7,000 students. Many hundreds of these additional students are married and have brought their wives and children with them. Under

present law adequate provision has not been made for the needs of this increase in population.

My question is: Does this provision in this bill as interpreted in the committee report authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and give him the power and responsibility to make adequate provision for the needs of greatly increased populations in such communities as Iowa City?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know that the bill provides adequately for such a situation any more than under short supply you could make adequate provision for anybody in the United States; but as far as those people are concerned, they would be considered either hardship cases, or rather, let me put it this way, the distributors under those circumstances may make application for increased quotas to meet the demand occasioned by any increase in population. That in itself should be considered a hardship case which the Secretary of Agriculture would have to recognize under the conditions of this act.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. He has that responsibility, but that has not been the case under existing law.

Mr. WOLCOTT. He will have that responsibility from now on; yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that every Member of this House will agree with me that the primary reason why we find ourselves in this sugar crisis is due to the fact that the price of sugar beets and sugarcane has been held down too low in comparison to other farm products. About a month ago the Governor of the Virgin Islands testified before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Interior, at which time I asked him what would happen to the production of sugar in the Virgin Islands if they were permitted to have an increased price of, say, \$2 a hundred on their raw sugar. He said, "We would produce approximately 25 percent more sugar." If the OPA had in the past few years permitted a more reasonable comparative price for sugarcane and sugar beets this problem would not confront us today.

If I had my way we would decontrol sugar right now, or at least permit the price to rise sufficiently to get the necessary production everywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee having heard the extensive hearings on sugar, I wish to say that I am very much in favor of the passage of House Joint Resolution 146, by Chairman WOLCOTT.

In my considered opinion, the best testimony of qualified witnesses proved

that the month of October was the best month to decontrol sugar. With sugar production in 1947 at a high level, I can see no reason to defer decontrol until 1948.

We have seen the pitiful spectacle in this country of the loss of milk, fruit, and other foods, considerable of which have been wasted because of the inability of housewives and new users to obtain sugar. I do not think it is fair to continue to give a monopoly to the present industrial users of sugar. Why should new enterprise be discouraged? Let us not forget that sugar is only one of the many problems in our present economy. I call your attention to increasing unemployment in many parts of our country which could be alleviated by the starting of new enterprises. Our business history is replete with stories of the growth of large corporations from small business beginnings.

House Joint Resolution 146 allows the Secretary of Agriculture to control sugar until October 31, 1947; it allows sugar for hardship cases and new-user cases; and provides inventory controls against hoarding until March 31, 1948. I strongly urge the passage of House Joint Resolution 146.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution under consideration, and usually I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], in matters connected with the sugar industry, since he represents the Sugar Bowl district of Louisiana, and I therefore join him in urging favorable action on this bill.

The compromises effected under this resolution in committee are now satisfactory to the producers of sugar in Louisiana, and in that connection I wish to submit copy of a telegram from the officers of the Louisiana Sugarcane League of Louisiana, as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., March 20, 1947.

C. J. BOURG,

Union Trust Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Reference decontrol of sugar, have contacted membership, executive and legislative committees. Overwhelming majority opinion strongly endorse definite and complete decontrol sugar October 31, 1947. This action taken in interest of 11,000 sugarcane growers who would suffer irreparable damage if decontrol is made effective March 31 instead of October 31, 1947. Kindly advise Louisiana congressional delegation of the position of our industry.

GEORGE L. BILLEAUD,

President.

MURPHY J. FOSTER,

Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, under the rule the Clerk will read the committee amendment which will be considered as an original bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

That (a) notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, (56 Stat. 23); the Stabilization Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 765); title III of the Sec-

ond War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 177), and the amendment to existing law made thereby; title XIV of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 177); and section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), all as amended and extended, shall continue in effect with respect to sugar to and including October 31, 1947, except that authority to continue inventory controls may be exercised to and including March 31, 1948: *Provided, however, That—*

(1) the authority contained herein shall not be deemed (i) to permit the allocation or rationing of any product (other than the allocation of such product imported or brought into the continental United States) unless a regulation providing for allocation or rationing thereof was in effect on February 18, 1947, or (ii) to permit price control over any product unless a price-control regulation with respect thereto was in effect on February 18, 1947;

(2) no person shall be subject to any criminal penalty or civil liability, under any such provision of law, on account of any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this act;

(3) sections 203 and 204 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall not apply in the case of any regulation or order hereafter issued in the exercise of any power, function, or duty transferred by section 3 (a) of this Act; and

(4) hereafter no person shall be required to secure a license, and no license shall be issued to any person, under section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, for the purpose of providing for the enforcement of any regulation or order relating to sugar.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising the allocation and rationing authority transferred to him by section 3 of this act, shall, in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, provide for the needs of hardship cases, for the needs of new sugar users, and for the needs of those who have no base period history.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 6, line 17, after "controls", insert "over other than household users."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have called attention earlier in the debate to the desirability of clarifying this language and, I believe, expressed the fear that unless it was clarified we might unintentionally continue controls over all users through March 31, 1948. It surely was not the intent of the committee when we authorized the continuance of inventory controls to include the householder. It has been suggested that this amendment is the easiest way to clarify it, that is, to restrict it to commercial and industrial users. If we were to use language that it was restricted to industrial and commercial users, of course we would have to define what is a commercial or industrial user, but it is very clear that the inventory controls, if they are going to be continued, should be continued as to everyone but the housewife, the household user. Therefore, probably the most direct approach to the problem is this that by eliminating the household users we include thereby all other users. It is in the interest of assuring that the controls over the allocation of sugar to the housewife for household uses will expire on October

31, 1947, that I believe this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Do I correctly understand that it is the position of the chairman of the committee that the Secretary should have the authority to ration industrial and commercial users until March 31, 1948?

Mr. WOLCOTT. According to action taken by the committee the inventory control could be exercised to and including March 31, 1948. Believing that it is the intention of the committee to limit inventory controls to industrial and commercial users, I have offered this language to exempt household users, to clarify the intention of the committee in that respect. As I have said, I am afraid that otherwise the Secretary of Agriculture might be justified in interpreting this language to mean that he would have the authority to exercise controls over the amount of sugar the housewife might have in her sugar bowl.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, Government departments have never yet brought inventory controls down to the household?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman's amendment makes the language clear, that there is no intent here that the Secretary of Agriculture shall fuss around with what is in the house?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is to restrict it definitely to commercial users?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the amendment is very proper.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Would the gentleman have any objection to ending all controls on October 31? Is not that the purpose of this bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I think I do have some objection to that.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I intend to offer an amendment when this amendment is disposed of.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I shall have an opportunity to explain my objection when the gentleman offers his amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment and think it should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT:
On page 7, strike out lines 7 to 11, inclusive, and insert the following paragraphs:
"(3) no provision of section 204 (d) or (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall apply (1) in any proceed-

ing, involving a regulation or order with respect to sugar, in which an injunction or other order of a court is hereafter applied for, or (2) in any proceeding under section 37 of the Criminal Code, which is based on a conspiracy involving any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this act;

"(4) in the case of any regulation or order with respect to sugar, no protest may be hereafter filed under section 203 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended."

In line 12, strike out "(4)" and insert "(5)."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this language is suggested by the legislative counsel to more clearly define what is intended. It is intended by the language in section 3 on page 7 to do away with the protest procedure now provided for in the Emergency Price Control Act with respect to violations or procedure after the effective date of the bill now under consideration.

It is our intention under this bill to eliminate the Emergency Court of Appeals in the participation in the reviews of violations under this particular bill. The Emergency Court of Appeals was set up to handle a situation which might arise wherein, because of a multiplicity of suits involving hundreds of thousands of commodities, chaos might result from even trying to enforce the price control laws.

At the time the OPA was administering controls over hundreds of thousands of commodities, it was essential, and you will recall that many of us predicted it here on the floor for some years. But there is no longer any need for continuing the cumbersome machinery under which these reviews are made in respect to price control regulations because the activity of the OPA is now pretty much narrowed. After the effective date of this act the OPA and the machinery for the enforcement of OPA regulations will no longer be in existence in respect to sugar controls and they should not be continued after the effective date of this bill because there would then be a conflict of jurisdiction.

As I stated before, the legislative counsel has suggested this language which I have offered to define more clearly our intent. In other words, he puts it in somewhat better language from the legislative point of view.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHENOWETH:
On page 6, line 16, after the figure "1947", strike out the remainder of the line 16 and all of lines 17 and 18 to the word "provided."

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be considerable confusion over the meaning of the provision I am seeking to strike from the bill by the amendment I have offered. No one can tell the House just what control the Secretary of Agriculture will have over sugar after October 31, 1947. My amendment will stop all controls over sugar on October 31 of this year.

The bill before the House has for its purpose the termination of the sugar rationing program, including the control of prices over sugar, as of October 31, 1947. My amendment, if adopted, will leave no doubt as to the effect of the bill.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] who addressed the House a few minutes ago, and who is an authority on sugar, made a strong argument for the amendment that I have offered. It is admitted that no one knows what the Secretary of Agriculture would do with this power to continue inventory controls. I have never heard it satisfactorily explained why he should have these powers. It is conceded that October 31 is the proper date to decontrol sugar, as we will then have a full inventory of sugar. This is the period when the candy manufacturers of the country will be anxious to make some Christmas candy. I am not particularly happy about the proposal that the Secretary of Agriculture, or any other Government official, should have the power to say how much sugar any industrial user of sugar should have on hand. I am thinking of the small candy makers, bakeries, soft drink bottlers, ice cream plants, and others affected. I want to see them get adequate sugar, which I am sure will be available. They are certainly entitled to this consideration.

Unless my amendment is adopted, I submit that you are giving the Secretary of Agriculture full power to continue the sugar program for industrial and commercial users until March 31, 1948. The control of inventories is all that he needs to regulate all industrial users of sugar.

We virtually continue the rationing of sugar until March 31, 1948, so far as these commercial users are concerned. I am opposed to any such extension.

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that we have to pass this legislation at all. I am ready to support this bill and continue the sugar program until October 31, the date set by the committee, but I am not willing to leave a loophole whereby sugar rationing of any type can be continued beyond that date. Congress should determine when sugar controls will be abolished and not leave this decision up to the Secretary of Agriculture, or anyone else.

I am seeking to strike the following language from the bill:

That authority to continue inventory controls may be exercised to and including March 31, 1948.

The gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the committee, considered this language so broad and far-reaching that he offered the amendment eliminating housewives from being included under these inventory controls. However, this provision still applies to all other users of sugar, and in effect continues controls until March 31 of next year. In other words, instead of abandoning sugar rationing and controls on October 31, as we have been led to believe was the purpose of this legislation, we are in fact extending controls over certain users of sugar for 6 months beyond that date.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we should adopt my amendment. I hope

it will have your approval and that we will end all sugar controls on October 31, 1947. The Secretary of Agriculture should have no inventory control or any other jurisdiction beyond that date. The only logical and reasonable conclusion we can draw from the discussion and debate this afternoon is that it is the purpose of this bill to end all sugar controls on October 31. I know the committee has given careful consideration to the entire sugar situation and is recommending the continuation of rationing and price control a few months longer. Personally, I do not believe the dire predictions of those who contend that chaos would result if these controls were removed at this time. I still have faith in the ability of our producers and distributors of sugar to see that a fair distribution is made. However, I am willing to continue price ceilings on sugar for a few months longer, but I certainly want to protest against the continuation of all controls over sugar, whether by the inventory method or some other ruse, beyond October 31 of this year. Let us make up our minds whether we want to terminate sugar control on October 31, 1947, or on March 31 next year. It seems to me the consensus of opinion is that it should come to an end on October 31, this year. If that is true, let us say so in plain language; in language that those administering sugar controls will understand. In order to avoid confusion and remove all doubt of our intention I urge the adoption of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon in the general debate I spoke out without qualification in favor of the October 31, 1947, date, as the best date for the removal of controls on rationing and price. However, I feel that if we were to adopt the amendment that has just been suggested by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH], which would remove inventory controls as of that date, it would be almost impossible to decontrol sugar as of October 31, 1947. I say that advisedly. This fact must be borne in mind: While on October 31, 1947, we will know exactly what the sugar supply will be for 1948, we still will not have the sugar stocks on hand, so that we still must wait a period of months before the crops from the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Cuba start reaching the mainland. If we were to decontrol as of October 31, 1947, on the inventory, we would have the same mad scramble among the big industrial producers that we might anticipate if we decontrol as of this date or as of March 31, 1947.

In addition to that, the amendment just offered by our distinguished chairman [Mr. WOLCOTT] very well clarifies the intent of this bill so that the people we principally want to help, that is, the housewives of America, will not be affected by inventory control. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] would adequately protect the housewives as of

October 31, 1947. But if we remove inventory controls and allow the big industrial users, who occupy a favored financial position, to go out and buy up the most outrageous inventories, then the price of sugar is bound to skyrocket. There are only four or five gigantic sugar users in the United States when you talk about big sugar users. If you put them in a position where they can buy large inventories, then the price of sugar will skyrocket beyond what the gentleman predicted a little while ago, and we are bound to have what the gentleman said, an effort on the part of those who want to continue controls to come back and say to us, "See what happened. Let us put the controls on again."

Therefore, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. In effect, the gentleman is arguing now to continue it.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No; I am not.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Practically, what you say continues the rationing of industrial sugar until March 31, 1948.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No; it does not.

Mr. CHENOWETH. If you control the inventory you control everything.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No. The committee amendment is very specific. The housewives will not be affected by the inventory control.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am glad to yield to my distinguished fellow committeeman.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Without inventory control to March 31, 1948, of course, the housewives would get less sugar.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Exactly.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Industrial users will hoard the sugar.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Exactly.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They certainly will not be placed in a favorable position by this amendment.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman is correct. The result will be that the industrial users will hoard all the sugar and the housewives get none of the sugar, and those who want to continue control of sugar will be able to come down here and make out a good case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate here today on sugar, and the committee have reported out a very fine bill. I feel, however, that all controls on sugar should be definitely eliminated on October 31, 1947. In the past we have listened to discussions as to the decontrol of oil, then we listened to discussion on the decontrol of meats and the dire consequences in event of decontrol but nothing happened. Now it is this emergency and that emergency—always an emergency. The time has now come when the American people are asking relief from restrictions

and regulations controlling and strangling business, restrictions and regulations that have killed the free flow of trade. I am asking the Members of this House whether we are going to degenerate this Government into some sort of bureaucratically controlled government, or are we going to return to free enterprise, placing the business of the country in the hands of the American people where it rightfully belongs? It is time to end all controls. There are 140,000,000 people in this Nation and we built without question the greatest productivity the world has ever known. Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, it was not built by control, restriction and Government regulation. It was built by the American way. It was built by initiative, courage, determination, energy, resourcefulness and hard work, we have built a great producing Nation of agriculture and industry, the envy of all the world. Let us now discontinue these controls that are strangling the free flow of trade and crucifying our system of free enterprise. Further controls are unnecessary and should be discontinued.

I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, let us once and for all clear up the question as to how the International Emergency Food Council is given the power to put the sugar produced and acquired by the United States into an international pool and thence ration out of that pool back to the United States an amount of sugar it determines to be our proper share, and let there be no equivocation about it.

Referring specifically to the source of the power exercised by the International Emergency Food Council to assume this function, I asked Mr. James H. Marshall, Director of the Sugar Branch of the Department of Agriculture, to state specifically who has the power to bind the United States to this international program and whether legal authority existed for it. He replied that the power is vested in the President and the authority for it exists in title III of the Second War Powers Act.

However, I am informed by counsel, the most competent on the Hill, that Mr. Marshall is mistaken in his position; that the authority which the President exercises in delegating to the International Emergency Food Council the power to place American sugar in a world pool and arbitrarily allocate back to us whatever it believes we are entitled to is not provided in article 3 of the Second War Powers Act, and that they can find no specific authority for it.

Now, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], chairman of the committee, has made a statement that

this power is somehow inherent in the President's powers to conduct the foreign affairs of the Nation. I want to challenge that statement. I do not believe the Constitution ever intended to vest any such power as we are here considering in the President of the United States. If the President has authority to exercise, or delegate to an international body the power to tell the people of the United States what portion of the sugar they produce and acquire must be exported to other nations and what part they may be permitted to consume themselves, then the President of the United States has the power to do this with respect to every other article we produce in the United States. Now, who is going to rise in his place and say the President of the United States has that power under the Constitution?

I pause. I want to see if there is any one on this floor who will rise in his or her place and say that the President of the United States has this power under the Constitution. No one rises and, of course, none can.

What I want to get across to the Congress and to the country is that even though all control over domestic rationing of sugar is repealed, we will still have rationing by the body known as the International Emergency Food Council, and that except for that international arrangement the people of the United States today would probably have all the sugar they want.

Let us tell the people the truth. They should know why they are unable to get more sugar and they should know that the blame for this is upon the Congress of the United States. Congress has the power to correct this condition.

One more point. The attempt is being made to give the impression there is nothing compulsory about this international arrangement, that the international group is only an advisory body. Whether that is true or not it has nothing to do with the question I am raising. The point I make is that the President of the United States has no power under the Constitution that authorizes him to accept any recommendation made by the International Emergency Food Council or to deal in any manner with an international body to set up this scheme.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman does not take the position that any sugars produced in the United States are sent to foreign countries, does he?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Oh, no. I simply say that the sugar we produce and the sugar we acquire is placed into an international pool, and from that pool is allocated back to the United States by this international body whatever amount of sugar it believes proper.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I wish to say that the sugar produced in the Hawaiian Islands, the Philippine Islands, Puerto Rico, and the United States is consumed in this country and not sent to foreign countries. It is true that we do purchase all the sugar in Cuba. It is contracted for in order to keep down unjust amounts to be paid for the sugar,

with the understanding that we will allot out of that amount a certain portion to foreign countries, like old customers of Cuba, but the sugar produced here as well as in Hawaii and Puerto Rico is consumed here and none of this sugar is sent abroad.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman's argument is entirely beside the point. What I stated is a plain simple fact and it is there for anyone to see who cares to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we on the Committee on Banking and Currency have been listening to witness after witness. Most every problem of our economy has been represented by the testimony that has been given. I want to pay a tribute to the large users of sugar, in all cases except one, in that they favored the bill as presented by the chairman of the committee in the first instance, to which I am adhering in thought. I really believe that when we substituted another bill for it we made a mistake. But if we add to that the lifting of inventory controls on the 31st of October instead of extending them to March 31, 1948, the result, in my opinion, will be that the small users of sugar and the housewives of this country will find no sugar. It will all be taken by the large purchasers who are able to pay higher prices and have easier access to making sugar contracts. This will be an absolute disaster to the housewives and the small users of sugar in this country, in my judgment, which I have formed from listening carefully to about 100 people.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. In one breath the gentleman praises the large industrial users of sugar and in the next breath he expresses a suspicion that they will deprive all the rest of the country of sugar.

Mr. FOLGER. They admitted that they could get it, but they did not want the opportunity and did not want to get into a scramble for it.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is it not a fact that all the large industrial users asked us to continue inventory controls until March 31?

Mr. FOLGER. Except one. The gentleman remembers that one, does he not?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have to be realistic about the situation. I do not think anyone desires to see these war controls come off any sooner than I. I think the position of many of us is pretty well known, that it is our purpose to take them off as quickly as we can with as little shock to our economy as possible. This bill as it is written at the present time would authorize and provide for gradual decontrol, with little or no shock to our economy, and with little or no economic or political shocks which might

be incident to or the result of taking them off prematurely.

I would rather put myself in the position of encouraging somebody else, some administrator, to take the responsibility for not getting sugar to the housewife after October 31 than I would take it myself. Surely the only harm is going to be possible harm to the housewife following October 31. No one else can be harmed by the continuance of inventory controls except the housewife. We are confronted with this problem. If the housewife is harmed by reason of industrial users operating in open competition with her; if inventories held by industrial and commercial users are built exceptionally high in October, November, and December against demand for candies, beverages, and everything else that is made of sugar, incident to the Christmas trade, I want the fault to lie in the administration of the law and not in the legislation itself. By October 31 people will be looking to December 25. The period between November 1 and Christmas is a period in which industrial and commercial users probably make, distribute, and market more candy than they do in any other period of the year.

Of course, there will be a tendency for them to, regardless of price, bid up every pound of available sugar on October 31 before the beet crop comes on the market, and, I believe, before the cane crop comes on the market, at a time when the inventories may be somewhat lower than you now expect them to be, because of a partial failure of the Cuban crop and because of a partial failure of the Hawaiian or Puerto Rican crop. We do not have any assurances that they are going to be up to the estimates, but surely we want to provide a hedge against crop failures to the point where the housewife is going to be assured of her proportionate share, her just and equitable share of sugar after October 31 and until such time as the new crops do come in. The only way I can see for us to do it and give her assurance that she is going to get her equitable share of these stocks is to give somebody the authority to tell the industrial users that they shall not at any time have more than a certain amount of sugar on hand in their inventories.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is telling the House now that you are not discontinuing the rationing of industrial sugar on October 31, but are going to continue it until March 31? No other conclusion can be drawn from the gentleman's statement.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman is correct. I may say to the gentleman that my bill originally provided for the continuance of these controls until March 1, 1948. I think I had a pretty good provision in the bill. I provided that the Secretary of Agriculture before October 15 would make his finding in respect of the necessity for continuing the controls after October 31. If he made this finding according to certain standards which we set up in the bill, then he

could continue them, even the inventory controls, beyond October 31, but not later than March 31. I think that is better language, but in my opinion on the basis of the practical situation we must defeat the amendment which the gentleman has offered.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have asked for this time so that I could ask my chairman a question. Let us be fair to everybody about this and let us be clear about it. If the Government of the United States says to corporation A, "We no longer have any control over the amount of sugar you use but are simply going to say you must not have on hand more than 5,000 bags at any one time," in doing that the Federal Government does not limit the amount of sugar that can be used and, therefore, the Federal Government does not restrict the quantity of sugar that the corporation can use or exercise rationing power. It is an inventory control power—an inventory beyond which you cannot go. Does my chairman agree with that proposition?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I must admit that the inventory controls contemplated after that date would not be as restrictive as the controls under the power which the Secretary of Agriculture will have up to October 31. If the Secretary of Agriculture by regulation says that this corporation A, to which the gentleman has referred, shall not have more than 30 days' supply of sugar on hand at any one time in his inventory, of course, there is little to prevent that corporation A from sending its employees out into the open market and picking up 5 pounds at a time here and there for the corporation's use. That is, at least some restriction on this practice and that is some guaranty that the housewife is going to get her equitable allotment of this sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CHENOWETH) there were—ayes 30, noes 115.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAMBLE: On page 7, line 24, after the word "history", insert a new subdivision (c):

"Nothing herein shall restrict the import of products of consumer size containers of not more than 3 pounds net each or more than one-half United States liquid gallons each, providing importers of such products shall obtain certification from the proper Government officials of the exporting country that products so shipped shall have been produced out of domestic quota sugar."

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, during the war certain American-owned companies at the request of the United States Army and with priorities granted by the United States Army, I am informed set up production facilities in Cuba for the production of certain food products, required by the Army, particularly guava jelly, to get vitamin C for the Army. They have now converted these facilities to the peacetime production of civilian consumer food products and are at the present time manufacturing jellies, jams, and certain types of sirups.

Cuba has been allocated out of the 1947 crop of sugar 740,000 tons, for Cuba's domestic use and for trading purposes with various South and Central American or other countries. Testimony before the committee disclosed that approximately 150,000 tons of this sugar is necessary for direct domestic sugar consumption in Cuba. This leaves a surplus of 590,000 tons available for sale, manufacture, and conversion, through consumer products, during the year 1947. This surplus is equivalent to over a billion pounds of refined sugar. Where does this sugar go? Some of it comes into the United States ex-quota in the form of jellies and jams, but due to import restrictions here in the United States, and an attempt to prevent diversion and maldistribution to industrial users in the United States, a great portion of this available tonnage of sugar-containing products goes to Europe and other foreign markets ex-quota.

The amendment which I have offered will give to the American consumer a part of this tonnage in sugar products now going to other countries. We cannot get all of it, naturally. Some of it is and must be sold and/or traded by Cuba for products necessary for her economy. In order to stabilize labor conditions, combat agitation, and control the inflationary spiral, the Cuban Government has planned to sell a part of this sugar for the manufacture of sugar products in Cuba at a cost to the purchaser of 2 or 3 cents above the low favored American price for raw sugar.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAMBLE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, this product that the gentleman is proposing to have shipped into this country is made out of sugar that is retained in Cuba or some other country and is not chargeable to the amount of sugar, that is, the quota that is turned over to the United States for American consumption?

Mr. GAMBLE. That is correct. It has no connection with the United States quota. It has only to do with the quota allocated to Cuba out of the Cuban production. Ex-quota, I believe they call it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course, that would apply to other products. Beverage companies could buy their sirup, made out of that same Cuban sugar quota, and ship the sirup into the United States without having it charged to the American quota?

Mr. GAMBLE. Yes; ex-quota if they bought the sugar at a price over the

price the United States pays for the sugar. But under the terms of this amendment they could only buy it for export in small containers of not more than 3 pounds each which would not be commercially or economically sound.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Should an American citizen go to Cuba or Mexico and buy 10 or 15 pounds of sugar, does the gentleman's amendment provide that that sugar can be brought into the United States without surrendering ration stamps?

Mr. GAMBLE. No; it has nothing to do with that situation, but I know it is being done right now. That is, sugar is being brought into this country by American citizens without producing ration stamps.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No. You cannot do it now.

Mr. GAMBLE. You can if you take the chance and get away with it.

But let me finish, if I may.

The money obtained from these sugar sales is used by the Cuban Government to purchase foodstuffs for the Cuban population.

Here is a potential supply of sugar for consumer use such as sirups and other low-cost items, and it would go far toward relieving the pressure on the American consumer for additional sugar. Testimony before the committee states that at least 250,000 tons of this sugar can be readily released for the manufacture of sugar-containing products and sirups for shipment to the United States. Reduced to simple terms this means that every American family would be able to obtain and purchase at least 12 pounds more of sugar products and sirups during the next 7 to 9 months of peak demand. It only requires that import permits be granted by the United States for that purpose. At the present time jellies, preserved fruits, coconut, and so forth, made in Cuba out of the Cuban sugar quota, are now shipped into the United States with permits. They are made by these same companies. These sirups are now on the restricted list of sugar-containing items which are prohibited from being imported under the regulations of the Sugar Branch, Department of Agriculture. I believe this is discriminatory under War Food Order No. 63. This order has been issued on the theory of some economists in the Department, that if this surplus of Cuban-manufactured sirups, on quota, were allowed to come into this country it would upset our economy. I repeat, the Department believes, apparently, that jams and jellies will not upset our economy but that sirups will. It just does not make sense.

This amendment would allow these sugar-containing products and sirups to be imported.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] not so much by what he had to say with reference to Cuban products but by the effect

that amendment will have on products produced by citizens of the United States, residents of Puerto Rico. By that I mean the Puerto Ricans. Puerto Rico is a sugar-producing area. There is allocated to Puerto Rico for household and industrial uses a given tonnage of sugar. We allow Puerto Rico to say how that shall be used. They make their own division down there between household and industrial users. It does not affect directly the quota of sugar allowed to the people of the United States.

If Mr. A, a Puerto Rican, takes that sugar and puts it into citron, sugared citron by preserving it, or candied citrus peel, fruits, we will call it, and sends the citrus peel or the citron to the United States, you receive it here in the form of candied products; it gives you sugar in that form and actually adds to your sugar supply just as this proposition would add to your sugar supply as it comes out of the quota assigned to Cuba under the Cuban sugar contract between Cuba and the United States.

Keep this in mind, Puerto Rico is an insular possession of the United States. We have got to underwrite the insular treasury. We send millions and tens of millions of dollars to Puerto Rico in the form of relief funds. Why under the sun do we refuse to let Puerto Rico take their sunshine and their natural fruits and peels and sugar them with the sugar they produce there, convert it through industrial processes, give their people employment, put it into the form to which I have referred, and then say to them they cannot send it to the United States without surrendering sugar stamps? This fight is up now between the Department of Agriculture and the Committee on Insular Affairs, and we are trying to induce the Department of Agriculture and OPA to let the sugar products produced by American citizens in Puerto Rico come into this country without our wholesalers or jobbers being forced to surrender sugar stamps.

The gentleman's amendment has been argued in favor of Cuba. Let the Cuban people do likewise if they want to take their sugar now and put it into preserves, jellies, and jams and send it to us, let them do it, and do not charge them sugar stamps. That is the point the gentleman is making, and with that I agree. But if you people want to protect the taxpayers of the United States with respect to sending relief funds to Puerto Rico, get hold of Mr. Marshall at the Department of Agriculture Sugar Branch and tell him to let these Puerto Rican products come in here without surrendering sugar stamps on the equivalent sugar in those products when they arrive here in these packages shipped to large industrial users like hotels and restaurants.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Prior to the holidays I received complaints from retailers in this country that manufacturers of candies and confections in this country could not fill their orders but they could buy foreign-produced candies and so forth.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Will not this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York accentuate that problem?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, it does not accentuate it for the reason that in the agreement to purchase sugar Cuba reserves the right to allocate to her people for home consumption, industrial and export use, so many tons of sugar, and having made that allocation as of the date we entered the agreement for the purchase of Cuban sugar they have that sugar reserved. If they want to ship that sugar up to us in manufactured products let them do it, paying the tariff, of course; we get that much more sugar.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The point I am interested in in this matter we are speaking about of shipping manufactured food products into this country, will these products come up to the standards set by the Food and Drugs Act?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It may or may not, I am not debating that, I cannot answer that. That is up to the control authorities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE and Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana rose.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield first to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. This amendment was never considered in the committee. I should like to know what effect it will have. It seems to be a special treatment to particular users. There is an axiom in law that hard cases make bad law. I do not see how we are going to meet all the contingencies that may arise to result in injustices under this act; it seems to me this matter is of sufficient importance that it should have been considered by the committee and testimony taken on it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Do I understand this amendment to permit the importation of liquid sugars?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think so.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Do I understand it to permit the importation of molasses and sirups?

Mr. CRAWFORD. In consumer-sized packages containing sugar chargeable to the reserve quota held back by Cuba. Suppose it did; we are getting the benefit of it.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. But is it not possible, though, by the use, for instance, of the ionic interchange procedure whereby you convert molasses to sugar in a liquid state rather than a granulated state, for the man who has the process to do that to get an advantage over the man who does not?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is in those small containers for personal use. This debate does not enter into the tariff question

whatever. It has to do with the allocation of sugar quotas.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am not talking about the tariff question; I am talking about the rationing question. If it is just as easy to use liquid sugar as it is to use granulated sugar, do you not give a man an advantage over his competitors?

Mr. CRAWFORD. But the point is that it is being charged to the Cuban sugar rationing quota, and if you want to give up 5 pounds to that quota and give to me, bring it over, and I will take the sugar.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. But he gets that additional advantage.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman mean the domestic consumer here?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Or the housewife.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No; the industrial user.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I did not understand that this covered the industrial user.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, restricting the size of the container would not be advantageous to the industrial user but to the individual.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The economics of it is this; by the time the industrial user acquires those small containers and converts them into his process, the cost will be very prohibitive against the other side of the proposition, at least, I think so.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. What effect will this have upon the candy manufacturers of this country?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the local manufacturers use it, that would be up to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The amendment may possibly have some good purpose, but in the first place it was never considered before our committee, and I think that it has a very definite danger.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GAMBLE. I offered the amendment before the committee, and I discussed it at length. One gentleman appeared before the committee, and it was the last man who testified before the hearings were closed. Unfortunately, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] and I were the only ones there.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I withdrew the amendment. There was no vote, but it was offered.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am sorry I was not present when it was offered. I want to point out to the House the danger of this type of amendment. In the sugar trade they have recently developed a process whereby you can produce what is called liquid sugar. This bypasses all of the usual procedures of processing and refining. You take your molasses or whatever the base product is and you come out finally with a product that has the same essential chemical ingredients as granulated sugar. I believe, without being too familiar with the amendment, because as I say I was not there when it was discussed before the committee, that this amendment could possibly achieve that result, and if it does that it is invariably going to give the man who has the process and who is able to utilize this method of using sugar an advantage over a man who has to go into the open market and buy granulated sugar, and by the same token it would discriminate against the housewife who must use granulated sugar on the table. Therefore, I think that this amendment has a considerable amount of danger, not having been fully considered, and without knowing just the full implication.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This amendment, I believe, refers to a 3-pound container. Does the gentleman recall the weight of a 1-gallon container of liquid sugar?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. No; I do not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, I would not be too certain, but I would guess around about 10 pounds per gallon; in other words, let us think in terms of one-third of a gallon container. Suppose I am a fellow who is using sugar in sirup form in my process, and I import sugar from Cuba in that form in one-third gallon containers. I have got to pay for that special packaging while my competitor can purchase sugar with his ration stamps on a hundred-pound basis; a 100-pound bag, for instance. I would be at an economic disadvantage which, in my humble opinion, I could not possibly overcome.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think that is true in normal times, but in these times when demand for sugar products is so tremendous I do not believe it is true. We had an illustration of that in New Orleans about 6 months ago, when the Federal Government auctioned off some ration-free sugar, price-control-free sugar, and it brought 26 cents a pound; so that I believe this amendment might very well work to the competitive advantage of the companies which are able to use liquid sugars in place of granulated sugars. Therefore, I would be inclined to vote against the amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will yield further, the very controls which we now exercise place the producer in a position to put sugar into a product and sell it on the basis of 26 cents per pound

sugar equivalent, because the housewife is forced to go to the baker and pay 80 or 90 cents for a pie and a dollar and a quarter for a cake, and those who buy sweetened products that go into ice-cream mix, for instance, are forced to pay the equivalent of 25 or 35 cents a pound for sugar right now. That is the reason I do not get so excited about talking in terms of the price of sugar at 15 cents a pound, and I favor the lower price as against the higher.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. That was exactly my point in my answer to the gentleman a moment ago, when he said that the man who imported the candy sirup would not be able to compete because of the additional cost. I say that in this day and time cost is no consideration. I firmly believe this amendment could give a great competitive advantage. It has been done before. Last year one of the great beverage companies of this country converted thousands and thousands of tons of molasses into liquid sugar and made pop out of it, and did not produce one single ration coupon. This year they stopped that practice. Under this amendment that thing could happen again. I hope the committee will not discriminate in this manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAMBLE) there were—ayes 69, noes 62.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me compose a direct inquiry to all the Members who are in Committee this afternoon: Have you ever been sued by the Government of the United States? It is not a very pleasant experience. When a United States marshal comes and serves process and makes you the defendant in an action in which the Federal Government is the complainant, you appreciate at once that behind that complaint there is the Treasury of the United States. Uncle Sam never relents. No amount of impatience and no delay in time is going to make a lot of difference when Uncle Sam becomes the complainant in an action against you.

We had many complaints under OPA, thousands of them. Then, one day, thousands of commodities were decontrolled, but the actions at law that were pending were not decontrolled. They are still there.

I sent a note to Mr. Remy, the enforcement officer of OPA, recently, and I found that as of October 31, 1946, there were pending in connection with decontrolled commodities, mind you, for which any action is no longer a violation, 45,131 actions of all kinds against citizens of the United States of America. In addition thereto there were pending 21,624 actions of all kinds with respect to commodities that were still under control. These figures include actions, investigations, anticipated actions, and complaints.

I respectfully submit to the membership this afternoon that when a commodity was decontrolled, why not give the little merchants, the small indus-

trialists, the humble citizen in all the 48 States of the Union, the benefit of the doubt and say, "Now that the commodity has been decontrolled we will also decontrol the action that is pending against you."

As a matter of fact, the OPA is investigating many of them right now because they carry in this summary 4,184 cases that are under investigation. There are 11,022 cases that are awaiting disposition. The number has diminished somewhat since that time, but the net fact is that in every one of the 48 States of the Union there are people who are within the shadow of Uncle Sam's heavy hand and his courts today for something that was done which was a violation or an alleged violation when control was in effect but which is no violation today. I would like to give them the benefit of the doubt.

At the end of this bill I shall offer a very, very simple amendment. It says simply this:

That notwithstanding the provisions of the OPA act, the administration shall not institute and he shall not maintain nor shall any agency of government—

And that means the Department of Justice—

institute or maintain any action that arose out of the sale of a commodity with the exception of sugar, rice, and a rent receipt.

So we make those exceptions because they are considered for continued control. Some of them may be continued as in the case of sugar.

But with respect to these other commodities, why not give the humble citizenry, the little lady who sells a hat for 39 cents over the ceiling, who is in the toils of the law today, and the grocer who sold a can of baked beans for 5 cents more than the list price and who is in difficulty because somebody filed a treble damage action—as I say, why not give them a chance? Let us do something about it. I hope this amendment is in order.

I have not asked the Parliamentarian of the House about it. The chairman of the committee has been very gracious about it. We have discussed it. It was not presented to the committee for the reason that I have been so busy myself with appropriations work and with the budget committee work that I frankly did not have the time. But I wish you would think about it because here is an opportunity to do something for people who are still within the shadow of the law as the result of an alleged violation for something which today is not a violation.

May I add that Mr. Remy, enforcement officer for OPA, has an adequate appreciation of this problem and has been genuinely cooperative in finding an administrative solution. I esteem it a matter of high importance which merits immediate action.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to keep faith with those engaged in agriculture. Perhaps I shall want to ask the chairman of the committee one or two questions. There has been handed to

me language which applies to lines 23 and 24 on page 7 of the bill. On line 23, after the word "cases", the language has been suggested to be added, "with particular regard to the needs of farm households and the prevention of wastage of milk, fruits, and perishable agricultural commodities."

I should like to ask the chairman if in addition to what the chairman has already given us along that line, he feels it is necessary for us to further strengthen the language in subparagraph (b) with respect to those particular items, or does the chairman and the committee feel that that matter is quite substantially taken care of under the language of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We had the alternative between allocating these percentages or writing the lines which we did in the bill, with the explanatory matter in the report. I might say to the gentleman, and perhaps to refresh the memories of those in the House on this point, that when courts interpret the language of a statute, especially where the court is trying to determine legislative intent, the courts look first to the language of the act itself. Then if there are ambiguities in the act, the committee report is taken next in importance to the bill in determining legislative intent. We decided we might run into so many difficulties in administering this law if we tried to provide percentage-wise allocations that it would be better to handle the matter by language in the report which would make it very clear as to what our intent was in that particular. We did that, and I believe that the language of the bill with explanatory matter in the report which for purposes of determining legislative intent are next in effectiveness to the bill itself, that the matter to which the gentleman refers will be adequately taken care of; and if it is possible to allocate it, the reasonable demands of every householder for canning purposes should be taken care of. It is our intent that they shall be taken care of if it is reasonably possible to do so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman for that explanation.

There is one other suggestion in the same paragraph: Following the word "history" in line 24, add this sentence:

In making allocations the Secretary shall give first consideration to medicinal, medical, food and other essential users.

I assume the remarks which the chairman has just made would apply also to that, the committee relying upon the good faith and integrity of the Secretary of Agriculture to use judgment and discretion and to follow the committee's intent as nearly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Prior to the expiration of the authority granted by this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to remove any or all controls with respect to any product over which control is authorized by this act when he determines that the supplies of sugar are sufficient to warrant such action.

SEC. 3. (a) The powers, functions, and duties of (1) the President under title III of

the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment to existing law made thereby: (2) the President or any executive department under section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940; (3) the Price Administrator under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; and (4) the President and the Price Administrator under the Stabilization Act of 1942, all as amended and extended (and irrespective of what officer, department, or agency may be now exercising any such power, function, or duty) are, insofar as they relate to sugar, hereby transferred to and shall be executed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) Every order, directive, rule or regulation relating to any power, function, or duty transferred by subsection (a) of this section, issued by any officer, department, or agency heretofore performing such power, function, or duty, which is not in conflict with the provisions of this act and which is in effect on the date of the enactment of this act, shall continue in full force and effect, according to its terms, unless and until modified or rescinded by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(c) So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds, and the property available for the use of any officer, department, or agency in the exercise of any power, function, or duty transferred by subsection (a) of this section or for the use of the Secretary of Agriculture in the exercise of any power, function, or duty so transferred, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine, shall be transferred for use in connection with the exercise of such powers, functions, or duties. In determining the amount to be transferred, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer. Such personnel as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to be required may also be transferred temporarily to the Department of Agriculture pending termination in whole or in part of the powers, functions, and duties transferred by subsection (a) of this section. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: On page 9, line 23, after the period following the word "act", insert "provided, nothing in this section shall in anywise be construed to violate any of the veterans' preference act of 1944."

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much time of the committee except to say that this is the amendment I discussed earlier in the afternoon.

I trust the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have not of course canvassed the committee, but so far as I personally am concerned I can see no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to do or omit to do any act, in violation of any order, directive, rule, or regulation continued in effect by section 3 (b) of this act or issued in the exercise of any power, function, or duty transferred by section 3 (a) of this act.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the Government, or for any adviser or consultant to the Secretary of Agriculture in his official capacity, to disclose, otherwise than in the course of official duty, any information obtained under this act, or to use any such information, for personal benefit.

(c) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 2 years in the case of a violation of subsection (b) and for not more than 1 year in all other cases, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 5. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing, and includes the United States or any agency thereof, or any other government, or any of its political subdivisions, or any agency of any of the foregoing: *Provided*, That no punishment provided by this act shall apply to the United States, or to any such government, political subdivision, or agency.

(b) The term "sugar" means any grade or type of saccharine product derived from sugarcane, sugar beets, or corn, including liquid sugar, sirups, molasses, or mixtures thereof, and sugar-containing products, which contain sucrose, dextrose, or levulose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: After line 7, on page 11, add a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 6. A new section is added to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this act, no action shall be instituted or maintained under section 205 (a) or 205 (c) by the Administrator, or on behalf of the United States by any other officer or agency of the Government, if the violation arose out of the sale of a commodity other than sugar or rice or the payment or receipt of rent for defense area housing accommodations."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill under consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman would withhold the point of order for a moment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I will be delighted to reserve the point of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, indulge me just a moment to say that this proposal to decontrol actions at law and to give our people a little break and to take them out from under the shadow of law is not quite so startling as it sounds. I have spoken some with the enforcement officials of OPA, and they have been endeavoring to set up some kind of a cut-off, measured in terms of dollars below which they would automatically throw these actions out of court. Whether it should be \$2,000, \$3,000, \$9,000, or \$10,000, is a matter in question. They did submit to me a figure to the effect that at \$3,000 probably 60 percent of these actions would go into the discard. So, you see, the enforcement officials of OPA have been giving this matter some consideration. I think it would be an astonishing thing

indeed, however, if, with respect to decontrolled commodities, all these actions at law were some day transferred to the Department of Justice, and that out of violations that arose from the sale of commodities, other than sugar, rent, or rice, that people will still be relentlessly pursued by the Government when they have come under a violation. The matter is worthy of real consideration by the House, because this shadow is upon these people until either administrative or legislative action has been taken.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the point of order it did occur to me that because of the general policy set out in the bill, and in view of the fact that it relates to the whole OPA act, the Stabilization Act and the Second War Powers Act, that it might be germane to the bill, notwithstanding the fact that it deals broadly with OPA, whereas the bill in question relates only to one commodity.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman's amendment in relation to audits of possible overpayment of subsidies entirely substitute the provisions of the price-control procedure?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I doubt it very much.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I wonder if the gentleman will not agree with me that it might be better if these matters could be worked out administratively, in view of the subsidy just mentioned by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]? If the enforcing officials of OPA could work this matter out separately and as an administrative policy, it would be better than approaching it by legislation here. I have prepared a bill that proposes to do the same thing. I understand that there was \$123,000,000 in subsidies involved. I wonder if the gentleman would not agree that it could be worked out much better administratively?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My answer is: It is equally effective whether it is worked out administratively or legislatively, but the essential thing is that nearly 6 months have gone by since these commodities have been decontrolled, and these people still have an action at law hanging over them in the Federal courts of the country.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, since this bill deals exclusively with sugar, and since the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois specifically exempts sugar from any consideration in the amendment, I renew my point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Illinois has offered an amendment to which the gentleman from Oklahoma has raised a point of order upon the ground that it is not germane. As indicated by the gentleman from Oklahoma, the resolution before the Committee, both in its title and in the provisions contained in the

body of the bill, relates solely and exclusively to the commodity of sugar.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois seeks to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 by adding a new section. The effect of that amendment is to cover commodities of all sorts, types, and descriptions, remedies, penalties, and procedures covered by the Price Control Act of 1942, with the exception of sugar; therefore, in the opinion of the Chair, it is not germane to the resolution before the Committee of the Whole, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the preamble to the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the war has resulted in an acute shortage of sugar to an extent which is impairing the reconversion of the national economy from war to peace; and

Whereas it is in the interest of national defense and security to effectuate an orderly distribution of sugar at reasonable prices in order to prevent profiteering, hoarding, market manipulation, and speculation in sugar; waste or spoilage of perishable agricultural commodities; and to prevent or eliminate other disruptive practices arising out of the scarcity of sugar: Therefore be it

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of the preamble.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 149, he reported the resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to strike out the preamble.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 287, nays 54, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

—YEAS—287

Abernethy	Gamble	Miller, Md.
Albert	Gary	Miller, Nebr.
Allen, Calif.	Gathings	Mills
Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	Mitchell
Allen, La.	Gifford	Monroney
Almond	Gillette	Morgan
Andersen	Gillie	Morris
H. Carl	Goff	Morton
Anderson, Calif.	Gordon	Muhlenberg
Andresen	Gore	Mundt
August H.	Gossett	Murdock
Andrews, Ala.	Graham	Murray, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Y.	Granger	Murray, Wis.
Angell	Grant, Ala.	Nixon
Arends	Gross	Nodar
Auchincloss	Hagen	Norblad
Bakewell	Hale	Norman
Barrett	Hall	O'Brien
Bates, Ky.	Edwin Arthur	O'Hara
Battle	Halleck	Owens
Beall	Hand	Pace
Beckworth	Hardy	Passman
Bell	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Bennett, Mich.	Harris	Patterson
Blackney	Harrison	Peden
Blatnik	Hart	Phillips, Calif.
Boggs, La.	Havenner	Pickett
Bolton	Hays	Ploeser
Bonner	Hébert	Plumley
Boykin	Hedrick	Poage
Bradley, Calif.	Herter	Poulson
Bramblett	Heseltun	Price, Fla.
Brooks	Hess	Price, Ill.
Brophy	Hill	Priest
Brown, Ga.	Hinshaw	Rayburn
Bryson	Hobbs	Redden
Buchanan	Hoeven	Reed, Ill.
Buck	Holmes	Rees
Buffett	Horan	Reeves
Burke	Howell	Richards
Burleson	Huber	Riley
Busbey	Jackson, Wash.	Robertson
Butler	Jenkins, Ohio	Robison
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenkins, Pa.	Rockwell
Camp	Jennings	Rogers, Fla.
Cannon	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Carroll	Johnson, Ill.	Rohrbough
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Ind.	Russell
Chapman	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Sadlak
Chenoweth	Jones, Wash.	Sadowski
Chiperfield	Jonkman	Sanborn
Church	Judd	Sasscer
Clark	Karsten, Mo.	Scott, Hardie
Clason	Kearney	Scott,
Coffin	Keating	Hugh D., Jr.
Cole, Kans.	Kee	Seely-Brown
Cole, N. Y.	Keefe	Sheppard
Colmer	Kefauver	Sikes
Combs	Kelley	Smathers
Cooley	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Corbett	Kerr	Smith, Va.
Courtney	Kilburn	Snyder
Crawford	Kilday	Somers
Crosser	King	Spence
Curtis	Kirwan	Springer
D'Alesandro	Kunkel	Stefan
Davis, Ga.	Lane	Stevenson
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Stigler
Dawson, Utah	Larcade	Stockman
Deane	Lea	Stratton
Devitt	LeCompte	Sundstrom
D'Ewart	LeFevre	Taber
Dingell	Lesinski	Talle
Dirksen	Lodge	Teague
Dolliver	Love	Thomas, Tex.
Domengeaux	Lusk	Thomason
Dondero	Lyle	Tibbott
Donohue	Lynch	Tollefson
Dorn	McConnell	Trimble
Doughton	McDonough	Twyman
Douglas	McMahon	Vail
Durham	McMillan, S. C.	Van Zandt
Eberhart	McMillen, Ill.	Vorys
Ellis	Madden	Walter
Ellsworth	Mahon	Welch
Engel, Mich.	Maloney	West
Fallon	Manasco	Whittington
Fellows	Mansfield,	Wigglesworth
Fenton	Mont.	Williams
Fisher	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Ind.
Flannagan	Mathews	Wolcott
Fletcher	Meade, Ky.	Wolverton
Fogarty	Meade, Md.	Woodruff
Folger	Michener	Worley
Foot	Miller, Calif.	Zimmerman
Forand	Miller, Conn.	
Fulton		

NAYS—54

Banta	Hoffman	Rizley
Bender	Jenison	Schwabe, Mo.
Bennett, Mo.	Jensen	Schwabe, Okla.
Bishop	Jones, Ohio	Scoblick
Brehm	Knutsen	Scrivner
Carson	Lemke	Shafer
Clevenger	Lewis	Short
Clippinger	McCowen	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	McGregor	Smith, Kans.
Cotton	Merrow	Smith, Ohio
Cunningham	Meyer	Smith, Wis.
Elliot	O'Konski	Vursell
Engle, Calif.	Phillips, Tenn.	Weichel
Evins	Preston	Wheeler
Gavin	Ramey	Whitten
Goodwin	Rankin	Winstead
Gwinn, N. Y.	Reed, N. Y.	Wood
Gwynne, Iowa	Rich	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—91

Arnold	Gallagher	Macy
Barden	Gerlach	Mansfield, Tex.
Bates, Mass.	Gorski	Marcantonio
Bland	Grant, Ind.	Mason
Bloom	Gregory	Morrison
Boggs, Del.	Griffiths	Norrell
Bradley, Mich.	Hall	Norton
Brown, Ohio	Leonard W.	O'Toole
Buckley	Harness, Ind.	Peterson
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Pfeifer
Byrne, N. Y.	Heffernan	Philbin
Canfield	Hendricks	Potts
Case, N. J.	Hollifield	Powell
Celler	Hope	Rabin
Chadwick	Hull	Rains
Clements	Jackson, Calif.	Rayfiel
Cooper	Jarman	Riehlman
Coudert	Javits	Rivers
Cox	Johnson, Tex.	Rooney
Cravens	Jones, N. C.	Ross
Crow	Kearns	St. George
Dague	Keogh	Sarbacher
Dawson, Ill.	Kersten, Wis.	Simpson, Pa.
Delaney	Klein	Stanley
Drewry	Landis	Taylor
Eaton	Latham	Thomas, N. J.
Elsaesser	Lucas	Towe
Elston	McCormack	Vinson
Feighan	McDowell	Wadsworth
Fernandez	McGarvey	Wilson, Tex.
Fuller	MacKinnon	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Canfield for, with Mrs. St. George against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Clements.

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Cravens.

Mr. Latham with Mr. Rabin.

Mr. Towe with Mr. Cox.

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Rooney.

Mr. Coudert with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall with Mr. Gorski.

Mr. Brown of Ohio with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Chadwick with Mr. Feighan.

Mr. Case of New Jersey with Mrs. Norton.

Mr. Wadsworth with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Riehlman with Mr. Klein.

Mr. Ross with Mr. Mansfield of Texas.

Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Gregory.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. Macy with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Rayfiel.

Mr. Dague with Mr. Jarman.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Celler.

Mr. MacKinnon with Mr. Stanley.

Mr. Grant of Indiana with Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Drewry.

Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Hope with Mr. Cooper.

Mr. Bates of Massachusetts with Mr. Byrne of New York.

Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Crow with Mr. Peterson.

Mr. Boggs of Delaware with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Bradley of Michigan with Mr. McCormack.

Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. O'Toole.

Mr. Elston with Mr. Fernandez.

Mr. Griffiths with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Mason with Mr. Hollifield.

XCIII—153

Mr. GAVIN and Mr. COLE of Missouri changed their votes from "yea" to "nay." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 146.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 367, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as commissioners of the United States Princeton University Bicentennial Commission the following Members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. ANDREWS of New York, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. MATHEWS, and Mr. FEIGHAN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him at a convention of the American Legion at Indianapolis, Ind., on March 20.

Mr. CORBETT and Mr. SOMERS asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an address delivered by the Speaker over the American Broadcasting System on March 15 in behalf of the American Red Cross, and in the other an article appearing in the New Leader of March 15, 1947.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] secured permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "Marine Operating Problems of the Panama Canal and the Solution Thereto." He has been notified by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$266.25. Notwithstanding that fact, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in today's issue of the Washington Daily News.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DELETION FROM RECORD

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the statement I made on March 17 on page 2219 of the daily RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, after conferring with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as well as the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 1000 assigned to the Committee on Foreign Affairs be transferred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a petition from the offices of the Independent Political Slovak Club of Monessen, Pa.

PALESTINE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, for a long time the American Government has been committed to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. For a long time the British Government has been committed to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. Following the recent war, the British, without consulting us, stopped the immigration of Jews into Palestine. After tremendous protest, the British Government jointly, with our Government, established an Anglo-American Commission which studied this problem, and after months of deliberation and investigation, recommended the admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine. The British Government promptly reneged on the official Anglo-American Commission's recommendations for the admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine.

Mr. Speaker, our good President, Mr. Truman, has been insistent, has several times called to the attention of the British Government the fact that this Government and the American people believe that in all justice and in line with the commitments made by the British Government and the American Government, that 100,000 Jews should be admitted to Palestine. This the British have persistently refused to permit, and day by day are driving refugees from Hitler Germany at the point of the bayonet into new concentration camps on the island of Cyprus. I sum up and refresh our memory on these facts because they have a most important bearing on our good President's request for \$400,000,000.

I wish to suggest that the British Government's word, and further, that its judgment, cannot be depended upon.

They would have us believe that Greece is important to our security, but their actions prove that Greece is unimportant to their security.

Mr. Speaker, the important thing about the President's request for funds is this. We propose to enter the political and economic life of the Middle East in a decisive way. That means that we intend to have our say, probably to become the dominant power—international power—in Greece, Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Trans-Jordan, Egypt, Iraq, Iran, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, in short, in the whole Near East-Middle East area. It is impossible to propose that we should take hold of the situation in Greece and Turkey without entering, becoming responsible for, the political, economic situation in every single near- and middle-eastern country.

Mr. Speaker, the British say that they need us to help them. Why then do not the British give us an equal voice in the solution of the question of Palestine? If the British need us to maintain their position in the Middle East, if they need our \$400,000,000, why would not the British admit 100,000 Jews to Palestine? And why does not our State Department demand as a price for our even considering the question of advancing \$400,000,000 that the British at least live up to their official commitments now 30 years old? How in God's name can we trust the judgment of the British Government or the word of the British Government? How can we continue to pour out the money of American men and women when we witness now the daily violation of the word of honor of the British Government on Palestine. Mr. Speaker, I ask now, on the floor of the House, of our State Department, when will the British agree to the announced American policy for the admission of 100,000 homeless, hungry, Jewish refugees from Nazi oppression into their historic homeland?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MAHON, for March 20, on account of illness.

To Mr. CHADWICK (at the request of Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch dated March 16, 1947; an editorial from Life magazine of March 17, 1947, entitled "Our Foreign Policy Crisis"; and an editorial from the New Orleans Item dated March 19, 1947, entitled "America's Great Opportunity."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CREATION OF A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which, if adopted, will put the Congress

of the United States on record as favoring the creation of a United States of Europe. It is a simple resolution consisting of one sentence: "That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within framework of UN." The resolution, in my opinion, is timely and vital. It comes at a time when people all over America are repeating President Truman's assertion of last week when he addressed us on Greece that "Nobody knows where this will lead us," and it comes at a time when all thoughtful Americans are asking "After this, what?"

I believe that the vast majority of the Members of this body are in accord with our President on the necessity of rescuing Greece and the Near East from the aggressive communism sponsored by Moscow. I believe that the American people thoroughly appreciate the vital necessity of supporting the President. Students of history have drawn the parallel between the President's remarks of last week and President Roosevelt's "quarantine the aggressor" speech of 1937. They have pointed out how President Roosevelt's prophetic words fell upon deaf ears and how the democratic world suffered the humiliation of Munich and was finally subjected to the blood bath of the Second World War because of a policy of stupid appeasement. Yes; Mr. Speaker, we all know that appeasement and isolationism will not work. They have been tried twice and both times humanity has been subjected to the catastrophe of international warfare.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What nations are to be in this United States of the World, and how are they to vote? What vote is to be given to each nation?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. My resolution does not contemplate the details of the organization, which will be set up in Europe; and in addition, it is not the United States of the World, it is the United States of Europe.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is going to be confined to the nations of Europe?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Under what theory does the gentleman believe we can advise Europe what to do?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If the gentleman will allow me to proceed I shall go on with my statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I shall be glad to, and I will listen with a great deal of interest because I am wondering how we could impose our will on those other nations.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think the gentleman will be very much interested.

Just as appeasement made Hitler secure in his belief that the democracies were soft and complacent and would not fight, a similar policy will convince the leaders of the Kremlin that the democratic world can be conquered by diplomatic maneuvers and threats of force and war. Therefore, I believe that all thinking Americans will support our Chief Executive. But, as the New Orleans Item pointed out in a forceful and magnificently written editorial of several days ago, entitled "America's Great

Opportunity," the policy of holding fast and firm and of going to the help of the democratic nations of Europe, is a good policy but not good enough.

Our policy, such as it is, springs not from action but reaction. Since the end of the war we have waited for Russia to punch, and then (sometimes) we counterpunch. Our counterpunching, especially in the last year, has been effective, but in the long run it won't be effective enough.

Having no sovereign European plan of its own, the United States has been forced on the defensive. Our policy really consists of merely opposing Russian expansion. That certainly is better than acquiescing, but it still is negative. It offers no permanent relief. Even as a temporary expedient it has not been too successful.

In short, Mr. Speaker, my resolution would seek to recognize the fundamental truth that we have no positive foreign policy in Europe. It would substitute affirmative action and would point the direction that Europe must follow if it is again to become the great force for morality, for Christianity, and for progress that it has historically enjoyed in the world. There is no alternative. Already this Nation has appropriated or made available approximately \$31,000,000,000 in American money for the rehabilitation of Europe, and despite this fabulous sum of money, the problem of Europe becomes more acute and more pressing as each day passes. No wonder Americans are saying, "Where do we go from here?"

Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the men who drafted our magnificent Constitution and who made possible this glorious Federal Union of ours had not succeeded, and suppose our 48 sovereign States were 48 sovereign nations, with separate currencies, different ways of doing business, unintegrated systems of transportation and communication, with all sorts of trade restrictions and barriers, with separate armies and taxing authorities. Do you think that for one moment we would have here today on this continent this mighty Nation? Do you think our States would have been spared constant warfare? Do you think that our Nation would have achieved the unbelievable prosperity and scientific advancement that we now have? Suppose it were necessary to pay taxes and effect an international currency exchange to ship iron ore from the Great Lakes to Pennsylvania, and to transport crude oil from Texas to New York, or to move cotton from Georgia to New England. The very notion is fantastic.

Yet, this is what we are trying to do in Europe. We are trying to reconstitute all sorts of artificial barriers. We are playing a game of power politics in an era where power politics are as outmoded as the feudal system.

Is the plan that my resolution contemplates impractical? Is it utopian? Is it new or novel? All of these assertions have been made. But first, let us talk about whether or not it is impractical or utopian.

What can be a better illustration than the little country of Switzerland. There is the United States of Europe in miniature. The Swiss differ religiously, racially, politically, socially, industrially, and linguistically, yet the 25 cantons are

welded into a federation with a common economic, foreign, and military policy, and without loss of essential sovereignty or the sacrifice of culture or tradition.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not Switzerland a shining example of isolationism?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I do not think so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There it is right in the middle of things and it has never taken part in any war, but has just been tending its own business.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Switzerland has achieved a magnificent advance in Europe because of its unification.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is a little oasis of peace and prosperity, is it not?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Because it minds its own business and it does not interfere in any way with any of its neighbors.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think history will prove, Mr. HOFFMAN, that there are many factors other than what you call appeasement which have contributed to that situation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I have been listening with intense interest to the gentleman. The gentleman has mentioned the program for a United States of Europe which will relieve Europe of the situation in which it finds itself as a result of politics being played on the basis of the balance of power, which in my opinion has been the scourge of civilization for many a year.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman.

Four different tongues—French, German, Italian, and Romansh—are recognized as national languages. Fribourg, a Catholic canton, lives happily side by side with Berne, solidly Protestant, and synagogues are found in every canton. Every so-called canton is a real state, with its own government and parliament, its own laws and taxes, its own traditions and symbols, and its own local patriotism. The Swiss Federation, however, governs foreign affairs, monetary affairs, foreign trade and duties, and ensures the civil rights of the individual and the cantons.

And for a few other illustrations, think of all that has already gone before in Europe. Think of Italy, and the long years when Sardinia, Savoy, Sicily, Piedmont, Lombardy, Venice, Rome, Naples, and Trieste fought bloody, cruel wars; yet so-called utopianism brought about unity; and have you forgotten the centuries during which the German principalities and other sovereign units fought one another in a ceaseless struggle for power?

So, the argument that the plan is utopian or impractical falls by the wayside.

Is the plan novel?

On the contrary. It has been brought forward by the great thinkers of Europe for many centuries, and it has been ad-

vocated by intelligent Americans since the time of George Washington. It was George Washington who wrote the following prediction to General Lafayette:

We have sowed seeds of liberty and union that will spring up everywhere on earth, and one day, taking its pattern from the United States of America, there will be founded the United States of Europe.

Many leaders have worked to bring about the federation. After the First World War the movement received tremendous support from the great French leader and Premier, Briand. Before the rise of Hitlerism the Federation of Europe seemed almost certain of success. Twenty-six governments had approved the plan, and the union seemed to be in sight. Briand died, however, in 1932 and in 1933 Adolf Hitler proclaimed the Third Reich. Six years later the Hitler armies marched from country to country with a peculiar plan of unification and federation under the banner of "master race" and similar Fascist philosophies.

Today the federation, however, has powerful voices raised in its behalf. Already that peerless British statesman and leader Winston Churchill has spoken out in powerful terms. He has been joined by General Smuts, the Prime Minister of South Africa, and on this side of the Atlantic by John Foster Dulles, and many other outstanding authorities on foreign policy.

Churchill, in an address at Zurich some months ago, had this to say:

It—

Europe—

is the origin of most of the culture, art, philosophy, and science, both of ancient and modern times. If Europe were once united in the sharing of its common inheritance, there would be no limit to the happiness, the prosperity, the glory which its 300,000,000 or 400,000,000 people would enjoy. Yet it is from Europe that has sprung that series of frightful nationalistic morals, originated by the Teutonic nations in their rise to power, which we have seen in this twentieth century and which have for a long time wrecked the peace and marred the prospect of all mankind.

And what is the plight to which Europe has been reduced? Some of the small states have, indeed, made a good recovery, but over wide areas a vast, quivering mass of tormented, hungry, careworn, and bewildered human beings gaze on the ruins of their cities and scan the dark horizon for the approach of some new peril, tyranny, or terror.

They may still return. There is a remedy which, if it were generally and spontaneously adopted by the great majority of people in the many lands, would, as if by a miracle, transform the whole scene and would in a few years make all Europe, or the greater part of it, as free and as happy as Switzerland is today.

What is this sovereign remedy?

We must build a kind of United States of Europe.

If time permitted, I could quote at length from John Foster Dulles, and many others. Suffice it to say that a United States of Europe, I believe, is on its way. The great scholar Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi has polled the members of European parliaments and governments, and he has received 624 replies. Only 12 were against the plan. This summer in Geneva the first Con-

gress of European members of parliament will meet. It will draft a European charter, and submit practical suggestions for the economic and political integration of Europe.

In the words of the Item editorial:

Perhaps in spite of all the good omens this dream won't come true, but it is worth all the trying we have in us. It can't be tried at all without our leading the way. At this point only America has the means and the power to launch the idea, to encourage and influence its growth, and sustain it to maturity.

It will be costly, but not as costly as our present policy. It will be discouraging, especially at first, but not as discouraging as what is happening now. And, if we should ultimately succeed we will have accomplished one of the great undertakings of mankind.

The articles referred to are as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 16, 1947]

IN CLIO'S WOMB

"History," said Voltaire, "is the tread of wooden shoes going up the stairs, and the patter of satin slippers coming down." The patter of satin slippers on history's stairway now is the receding British Empire; the clatter of wooden shoes is the lumbering of Russian imperialism fired by the proselyting zeal of the Communist dogma.

The surging dynamic of communism cannot be met by tired, static and quiescent institutions which demonstrate daily in England, France, and Germany their inability to give the masses the standard of living which they have a right to expect of a modern industrial civilization. The Communist threat can be held at bay, but it cannot permanently be vanquished by such things as loans to Britain, Greece, and Turkey, an increase in the calorie content of German rations, or token forces, garrisoned like police squads, on Russia's boundaries.

Such measures as President Truman now is taking to call Russia's hand, backed up by the atom bomb and America's aptitude for industrial warfare, may restrain the ambitions of a Russia still staggering from blows received in the last war. But they are not a long-range answer to the dangers of an uneasy peace.

SEEDBED OF WAR

And indeed, if Russia and the United States went to war and Russia were resoundingly defeated, it would be no more an answer to the fundamental problem of European civilization than were the defeats of Germany in 1918 and 1945. Before the United States entered the last war, the Post-Dispatch said, in 1940:

"What are the historical forces whose ferment has brought Europe into a great war for a second time in a quarter-century? * * * This area is divided into many separate nations, each with its own illogical tariff barriers, which keep it from exporting its surplus commodities to its neighbors or receiving from them the goods in which it is deficient. * * * To carve a continent into a crazy quilt of small nations creates irresistible economic pressures. Recurrent explosions are inevitable until some machinery for relieving these pressures is devised."

There is more of a vacuum to fill than that of rotting empire. There is also the vacuum of frustrated economic institutions.

Communism's great ally in Europe today is not the cold, abstruse materialism of the Marxian doctrine; it is "balloon belly" in Germany and the Balkans, toothless children in France and Britain, and everywhere, from the crumbling cliffs of Dover to the Black Sea, scurvy and rickets and a door closed against a comfortable and decent human existence.

Yet the situation is not hopeless. A new age knocks on the door of time. The muse of history is in travail; a young giant stirs in Clio's womb, if only the midwives of European politics will stir themselves to attend its birth.

THE GREAT DESIGN

Amidst the ruins of falling empire, there is an instrument that could be used to fill the void. That is a United States of Europe. It is an instrument not limited to the negative object of fending off communism, but possessed of a dynamic and purpose which can interpose a true bulwark against the Communist thrust.

It is a plan the need for which has been recognized from the Middle Ages. In the early seventeenth century, it was the great design of Henry the Fourth of France and his minister, Sully, and might conceivably have been achieved then had not Henry fallen at the hand of the addled ex-valet, Ra-valliac.

In the nineteenth century, another Frenchman, Victor Hugo, championed the idea. At the International Peace Congress at Paris in 1849, he said:

"A day will come when those two immense groups, the United States of America and the United States of Europe, shall be seen placed in the presence of each other, extending the hand of fellowship across the ocean, exchanging their produce, their commerce, their industry, their arts, their genius, clearing the earth, peopling the deserts, improving creation under the eye of the Creator and uniting, for the good of all, these two irresistible and infinite powers, the fraternity of men and the power of God."

In the late 1920's, as Europe teetered between two wars, yet another eloquent Frenchman, Aristide Briand, pressed for a federated Europe. With a mortal illness upon him—he was to be dead within the month—Gustav Stresemann, the German democratic leader, made a moving appeal for the Briand scheme in the League Assembly. But to the move for unity Britain opposed her old formula of "Divide and rule"; Briand's plan was stilted by the bumbling Baldwin, aided by France's Fascist Flandin. Now Europe's men of vision speak out again, trying to make themselves heard above the thunderous roar of torpor and inertia. Prime Minister Attlee has said, "Europe must federate or perish." Winston Churchill has said:

"If, in this interval, we can revive the life and unity of Europe and Christendom, and with this new reinforcement build high and commanding a world structure of peace which no one will dare challenge, the most awful crisis of history will have passed away and the highroad of history will again become open."

ESCAPE FROM FRAGMENTATION

The political advantages of European union have been well explored. Less has been said—much too little—about the economic, ethnic, and cultural advantages of federation. Therein lies tangible promise of a more prosperous life that can overcome lethargy and tradition and move men to clothe a dream with reality.

Shackled in their present narrow boundaries, and unsustained by the booty of imperialism which poured in so richly in the past, neither Britain nor the continental nations have much prospect of a high standard of living. But with their commerce revived by a free flow of commerce among them, with their talents pooled to utilize the fallow sections of the world, what a prospect of material rewards would unfold before them.

Across the oceans lie the black deltas of Africa, the rich plains and plateaus of New Guinea, the volcanic soil of New Britain and New Caledonia, the infinitely fertile muck of the New Hebrides and the Solomons, all waiting to yield up vast stores of food for

a mechanized agriculture, an agriculture which would give a prized outlet to the industrial genius of the Germans and the commercial talents of the British.

The world's mineral wealth waits to yield its riches to the same pooled efforts of British, French, and German capital and enterprise. Above all, the magic of organic chemistry and of atomic science wait to pluck from earth and air bounties which can be reaped only by large-scale industry serving merged populations unhindered by trade barriers and cartels.

TESTS OF A HEALTHY NATION

A United States of Europe, confident in its own strength, and sharing common ideals with the United States of America, would be freed in substantial measure from the crushing load of military budgets and could devote more of its resources to the causes of peace.

Bruce Hopper, the Harvard historian, in an essay on the rise and fall of nations, lists these three essentials of a strong nation today:

1. Actual possession of sufficient raw materials for advancing industrialism.
2. Possession of a highly developed industrial technology to support modern war.
3. An adequate population, a high reproductive rate of the manpower, virility, and energy.

Alone, no European nation has more than one or two of these three essentials for a strong and viable state. United they would have all three in great abundance.

What should be the role of the United States in the creation of a like nation in Europe? First, the role is to guarantee the emerging federation from military interference by Russia. Second, to give financial assistance in generating economic strength. Third and perhaps foremost, to supply encouragement and vision for consummation of the project. It is President Truman's chance to bid for a place with the immortals.

TO LIFT EUROPE FROM DESPAIR

A thousand obstacles—political, racial, and ideological—to the creation of a United States of Europe spring instantly into the practical mind. But how precious are the prejudices and hatreds of Europe, compared to a plan that could lift the continent from a morass of despair?

World crises like the present one demand more than practicality. They require vision, imagination, and heroic boldness. No accomplishment could be more satisfying than to see this old and bloody continent, which has seen so much misery through the centuries, united, peaceful, and arrayed to achieve the full promise of its cultural past.

Let those who call themselves statesmen prick themselves awake with the sharp nettles of necessity and rise to the roles to which history calls them. Or if it is not in them to react with verve and vision, let them band together and act, as Kipling said, "from common funk." Like the famous advice Benjamin Franklin gave to the American colonies, for Europe it is a case of join—or die.

[From Life magazine of March 17, 1947]

OUR FOREIGN POLICY CRISIS—IT CALLS NOT FOR ACTIONS ALONE BUT FOR CLEARER AIMS AND MORE VIGOROUS IDEALS

Not since France collapsed in 1940 has United States foreign policy been under such strain as during the past fortnight. As Secretary of State Marshall went to Moscow on the momentous business of Europe's future, he left the United States Congress in a condition of bewilderment and shock caused by news of far greater moment, namely Britain's impending withdrawal from Greece.

The Americans have a phrase for it: Things are tough all over. Sharp-tongued Harry Gideonse, president of Freedom House and Brooklyn College, publicly hoped for

Europe's and America's sakes that the Moscow Conference would fail. The experienced diplomat, Robert Murphy, left Berlin for the Conference in a mood which indicated he was sure it would fail. As for the decision on Greece which faces Congress, even Truman, whose sunny demeanor has struck a cheery note during this solemn fortnight, was gloomy and uncertain. Said he to the Congressmen, "Nobody knows where this will lead us."

No, of course nobody knows. But we can be sure of this: no Moscow conference, no Greek loan, no diplomatic step of any kind will lead us very far unless we can surmount such challenges with a clearer idea of what we think we are up to. Representative Eason, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, spoke the general need when he asked the President to "enunciate a world policy" into which the Greek, German, and other parts of the puzzle could be fitted. At last week's end the President was working on it. But the issues in this crisis run very deep. Not only the President but every interested citizen should think where we are heading.

TEN MILLION CRIMES

In sending George Marshall to Moscow the United States has no reason to fear that its end of that negotiation will be bungled. He is clearly a man of enormous competence, who knows what he wants from this conference, what opposition he will probably meet and what prices he will pay to overcome it. At once literate and businesslike, Marshall in his recent Princeton speech quoted approvingly from Justice Holmes: "Man is born to act. To act is to affirm the worth of an end, and to affirm the worth of an end is to create an ideal." This sentiment, it will be noted, makes ideals a byproduct rather than the motive of action.

As a practical man Marshall must base his German policy on what has gone before: the Potsdam Declaration, in which the Big Three agreed to punish, disarm and control Germany, and the Byrnes speech at Stuttgart, which promised national unity and a measure of hope to the German people. The economic unity of Germany, which Potsdam and Byrnes both promised, is therefore high on our Moscow agenda. It is an essential step toward the amelioration of Germany's acute misery and the economic recovery of Europe. Since the Soviets want more reparations from German production, agreement on this will be less a question of principle than of price.

But another left-over from Potsdam is a question of principle. Potsdam permitted the Poles in clear violation of the Atlantic Charter (to say nothing of human decency) to uproot and expel some 10,000,000 Germans from what used to be eastern Germany and is still not legally part of Poland. Competent witnesses have called this expulsion "a crime against humanity for which history will exact a terrible retribution." Having abetted this crime in advance at Potsdam, the United States is not likely to undo it at Moscow. There we will be asked to approve the Oder-Neisse line as Poland's legal boundary, thus repudiating the Atlantic Charter in letter as well as in spirit. Marshall is reportedly prepared to agree to an imperfect boundary if it will help him drive a bargain on some other front. Will he thereby invite history's retribution? Or must all active diplomacy involve some abetting of crime?

In Greece, if we take over the British commitment adequately, we will be abetting a civil war. The Greek Government is a rachitic monarchy revived by Winston Churchill. It makes no secret of what it wants of the United States: not just money but arms and moral support for the suppression of rebels. These rebels are salients of the Soviet drive for a Slav-Communist Balkan federation. If we leave Greece to its own fate, its Government will be overthrown and it will become part of this Communist federation. A chain reaction might well be

started, producing Communist triumphs or advances throughout the Mediterranean world.

SOMETHING MISSING

Indeed things are tough: in Korea, China, India, Turkey, Hungary, Austria, all over. Things add up to what the Washington Post calls "a crypto-war situation" between the United States and Russia, a war whose stakes and fronts are at once territory and the minds of men. To Britain, Greece was a vital link in the old Suez lifeline. To America it is vital for equally stark and imperial, though for strategically different reasons. We must extend our influence and commitments there simply because political physics abhors vacuum. That alone is a sufficient reason for Congress to back Truman and Marshall with a subsidy for Greece.

It is not a very inspiring reason, however, and in this crisis there is something much nobler in Congress' puzzled reluctance than there is in the impatience of our professional diplomats. To the latter the case for our intervention in Greece, like the case for realistic bargaining in Moscow, is open and shut. The operation they call "stern containment" of Russia is its own excuse for action. But Congress senses—quite rightly—that something is missing from such a foreign policy. The name of this missing ingredient is idealism, the kind of idealism which precedes and warrants action instead of tagging after it. It has been missing from our foreign policy for some time.

Among Marshall's advisers in Moscow is one who has peculiarly concerned himself with the role of ideals in foreign affairs. He is the international lawyer, Republican and church leader, John Foster Dulles, well known to the readers of *Life* (March 18, June 3, June 10, 1946). In recent speeches he has called again and again for more intellectual and moral vigor in the world leadership which history has thrust on the United States. "Negation," said he (i. e. stern containment?), "is never a permanent substitute for creation, and no nation is so poor as a nation which can give only dollars." He wants peace treaties that are not just compromises but that will "bring into being new forces which are curative and creative." Above all he wants a restatement of United States policy which will be consistent with the best ideals of our past.

Two examples of traditional United States policy which have served the twin causes of clarity and practical idealism are the Monroe Doctrine and the open door; another is our belief in the juridical equality of states and in free speech, which caused great improvements in the United Nations Charter at San Francisco. In Europe, however, our actions and words have not always coincided. If they had, two wars might have been avoided; we must not be guilty of what Dulles calls "contributory negligence" again. A clear statement of our European policy is now long overdue.

DULLES ON EUROPE

To Dulles, as to more and more thinking people, our policy should be to help the nations of Europe federate, as our States federated in 1787; and he has proposed Europeanizing the production of the Rhine-Ruhr industrial area as a practical step to this end. Thus could the Big Four help Europe become "something better than the rickety fire hazard of the past." But "if the Soviet Union does not want to advance continental unity as a whole," says Dulles, "then a worth-while start could still be made in western Europe. There 200 million people could, through increased unity, achieve increased prosperity, freedom and peace."

Greece, the cradle of Europe's 3,000-year-old civilization, is still part of Europe. If our goal for all Europe were as clear as Dulles', our intervention there now would fall sensibly into place as a holding operation. Accompanied by a clear statement of United

States aims, a loan to Greece (or to any other country) would be worth something. Not so accompanied, the money will be of dubious value and the adventure will indeed lead us "nobody knows where."

Regional goals, such as Dulles outlines, are not incompatible with more universal ideals. They are simply nearer and likelier to be achieved. Nor do they confine or commit us to the "spheres of influence" arrangement which, by the deal Roosevelt and Churchill made at Casablanca, has prevented us from taking a direct hand in Greek affairs until now. George Marshall was right when he said, "We are now concerned with the peace of the entire world." But as Dulles says, "Peace lies not in compromising but in invigorating our historic policies." The time to invigorate them is now.

[From the New Orleans Item of March 19, 1947]

AMERICA'S GREAT OPPORTUNITY

Just a year ago Soviet Russia threatened to overwhelm Iran; and out of that crisis developed the Byrnes policy of patience and firmness. By and large, it has been a good policy; but not good enough.

Today in Greece we have Iran all over again. Mr. Byrnes is gone, but President Truman and Secretary Marshall are holding fast and firm. The President has met the challenge of Russia, and there is little doubt that America will now come to the aid of Greece. So far so good; but still not good enough.

The plain truth is that, in a positive sense, America does not have a foreign policy, at least where Russia and Europe are concerned. Our policy, such as it is, springs not from action, but reaction. Since the end of the war we have waited for Russia to punch, and then (sometimes) we counterpunch. Our counterpunching, especially in the last year, has been effective, but in the long run it won't be effective enough.

In the reorganization of Europe we have been at a constant disadvantage because Russia knows what it wants and we don't. By assimilation, by puppet governments, by Communist Party collaboration, and other means, Russia is apparently bent on domination of the European continent.

Having no sovereign European plan of its own, the United States has been forced on the defensive. Our policy really consists of merely opposing Russian expansion. That certainly is better than acquiescing, but it still is negative. It offers no permanent relief. Even as a temporary expedient it has not been too successful.

When Russia calls the roll, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Bessarabia, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania answer. All have been lost to the ranks of democracy; and perhaps more are to follow. The struggle for Germany and Austria is now going on at Moscow. Italy and France are breathing under the oxygen tent of American dollars. Now Greece calls for artificial respiration. And we are driven to the humiliating expedient of backing Franco for fear Spain, too, will fall into the Soviet orbit.

The United States is falling in Europe; and it is falling because it hasn't a practical, long-range program for the continent. Just as after the First World War, we are trying to patch Europe together again without any regard for economic and political unity. Two World Wars and many smaller ones have shown that a disunited Europe, composed of numerous competing nations, can never hope for peace or prosperity.

What would a dis-United States be like? Suppose America consisted of the nation of Pennsylvania with all the coal, of Montana with the copper, Texas with the gas and oil, the Great Lakes region with the ore and industries? Suppose our great States and regions were nations, each with armies and

tariff barriers? Can anyone doubt that war and poverty would soon be America's lot, as it is Europe's?

UNITY ONE WAY—OR ANOTHER

Yet that is the way we are trying to reconstruct Europe. It is utterly hopeless and it won't work. Europe must be unified; there is no permanent alternative. Eastern Europe already is being rapidly unified by Russia; and if western Europe is not soon united by a democratic federation it, too, may find unity through totalitarianism.

The United Nations is not the answer to this problem. A United States of Europe could become a great and wonderful new force within the UN, as the United States of America is, but there is little that the UN can now do to solve the economic and political anarchy of present-day Europe. The noble task of welding western Europe into a new democratic power can only be accomplished by the nations at interest, with the support and encouragement of the United States of America.

As the foreign secretaries debate the German peace treaty at Moscow, it is quite clear that the German problem cannot be solved until we have solved the problem of Europe. The world is divided over whether Germany shall be made strong or weak. All Europe would benefit economically from a strong and highly productive Reich, but a vigorous Germany might again become a military threat to its neighbors. That is the dilemma at the Moscow Conference. But if Germany became a part of a United States of Europe, there would be no such problem. With fear of aggression abandoned, all hands would set about restoring German industry as fast as possible.

NOT AN IDLE DREAM

A federated Europe may once have seemed an idle dream, but today it is idle to dream of any other solution. It goes without saying that to rescue Europe by federation will be difficult, but to save it without federation is impossible. The nations of western Europe have now reached the same crisis that once faced the 13 Original American States—they can hang together or hang separately.

There is nothing new or novel about this solution. George Washington once wrote to General Lafayette: "We have sowed seeds of liberty and union that will spring up everywhere on earth. One day, taking its pattern from the United States, there will be founded the United States of Europe." And this vision is even now shared by most of the democratic leaders of the world.

Winston Churchill, who is no utopian, is presently championing a united Europe with all of his energy. Recently General Smuts and John Foster Dulles spoke up for federation. President Truman is sympathetic to the idea and Prime Minister Attlee is the author of "Europe must federate or perish." Leon Blum and Edouard Herriot have long been advocates of federation; and it is no secret that de Gaulle leans in the same direction.

Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, the famous spokesman for European federation, is now polling 3,913 members of European parliaments on the establishment of a European federation within the framework of the UN. So far he has received 624 replies and only 12 were against the plan. Among the 86 members of the French assembly who answered "Yes" are Vincent Auriol, now president of the Republic; Vice Premier Henri Teitgen; War Minister Paul Coste-Floret; Maurice Schumann, founder of the M. R. P.; and Rene Capitant, leader of the de Gaulle Union.

THEY ANSWERED "YES"

Of the 107 members of the British Parliament who voted for federation, 64 belonged to the Labor Party and 34 to the Conservative group. One third of all members of Italy's national assembly voted for the plan, including cabinet members and party leaders. The

Greek proponents number three party leaders and former prime ministers. Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands are already trying to create a customs-union in the heart of western Europe. Count Coudenhove-Kalergi believes that if a fair plebescite were held tomorrow on the issue of federation, men and women of all parties and nations would vote overwhelmingly for union.

Doubtless Russia would oppose such a solution. A divided Europe is a pushover for Russia; a united Europe would bring into being a great and self-sustaining new democratic power. The Russians would no doubt accuse us of organizing a new bulwark against communism. Thus there might be some friction at first. But how about the friction that exists now? If Europe remains helplessly divided, and Russia and America continue to battle month by month over one and then another European nation, we may have something worse than friction. A wise Russia would not oppose a united Europe, for what's good for Europe is finally good for Russia, too. After all, the Kremlin has a stake in peace, and the best hope for that is a stable, integrated Europe.

American dollar transfusions may save some of the European nations temporarily, but finally we will have to abandon Europe or help organize it into a healthy new unit capable of looking out for itself. There is not much time to lose, and the time for federation was never so ripe. Postwar Europe is still in a fluid state; its millions of citizens desperately need a new hope; the political climate is favorable; and, above all, the democratic world is looking to the United States of America for vision.

Perhaps in spite of all the good omens this dream won't come true, but it is worth all the trying we have in us. It can't be tried at all without our leading the way. At this point only America has the means and the power to launch the idea, to encourage and influence its growth, and sustain it to maturity.

SOMETHING TO STRIVE FOR

It will be costly, but not as costly as our present policy. It will be discouraging, especially at first, but not as discouraging as what is happening now. And if we should ultimately succeed we will have accomplished one of the great undertakings of mankind.

Whenever a government radically alters its foreign policy and embarks on an enterprise of great magnitude it needs the support of the people. It is unlikely that the present administration would adopt the objective of a United States of Europe without a mandate from the public. Therefore, we would like to see a resolution introduced in Congress which would commit the Government to this noble undertaking. We hazard the guess that such a resolution would receive tremendous support and kindle the hopes of all democratic peoples.

The resolution need not be long. As with the now historic Fulbright resolution, one sentence would be enough. For example,

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of a United States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations."

Just 100 years ago the great French writer, Victor Hugo, prophesied: "The day will come when these two huge unions, the United States of America and the United States of Europe, will face and greet each other across the Atlantic. When they will exchange their goods, their commerce, their industry, their art, and their genius to civilize the globe, to fertilize deserts, to improve creation under the eyes of the Creator. And to assure the greatest benefit for all by combining these infinite forces: the brotherhood of man and the might of God."

[From the New Orleans Item of March 20, 1947]

FEDERATED EUROPE PROPOSAL PRAISED

The Item's page 1 editorial yesterday advocating a democratic federation of nations in Europe—a "United States of Europe"—as the best possible means of maintaining the peace, met with favorable response in New Orleans.

Many letters and telephone calls came to the editor's desk expressing unsolicited agreement with the Item's program.

In addition the Item asked representative citizens of the State to express their opinion on the subject. A cross section of opinion is printed below:

Former Gov. Sam H. Jones: "Your editorial 'America's Great Opportunity,' is the most powerful argument for a 'United States of Europe' I have read. At the same time it gives a clear picture of our present inadequate foreign policy, particularly as respects Russia and Europe.

"The editorial's most potent quality, however, is the feeling one has when he finishes the reading—the feeling which says 'Why don't we do something about it?'"

Dr. Thornton Terhune, head of the department of history, College of arts and Sciences, Tulane University, and authority on European history: "I am in enthusiastic agreement with every word of the editorial entitled 'America's Great Opportunity.'"

"An on-the-scene study of the suicidal course which European affairs, political, and economic, have been taking for the past 20 years has led me to have one positive conviction concerning the future of Western Europe.

"That conviction is simply this: It may still be possible to save western Europe, but nothing can save the individual western European nations as such.

"It seems to me, after careful study of the editorial, that both the essence and point of its message are to be found in one particular sentence, the one wherein you state: 'It goes without saying that to rescue by federation will be difficult, but to save it without federation is impossible.'

"You are absolutely right. And there will be many who will say: 'Yes, but can western Europe be saved even by federation?' This I would answer by telling a little story:

"I once knew an elderly and seasoned physician of the old-fashioned family-doctor type who was rather given to positive expression when irked by what seemed to him a lack of intelligence. One of his charges, a well-intentioned but none too brilliant creature, had the misfortune to suffer a ruptured appendix, whereupon the physician recommended an immediate operation.

"'But, Doctor,' said the nervous patient, 'if they operate will you promise that I'll get well?'"

"'Hell, no,' he answered, 'but you're gonna die if they don't.'

"The analogy needs no amplification."

John Hall Jacobs, city librarian: "I extend my congratulations on your excellent statement of a plan which seems to be the best, in my opinion, that has been considered.

"It was a clear and helpful summary of the situation and as an editorial is in a class with the finest ones I have read.

"I agree wholeheartedly, with minor reservations, with this expression of our need for a program in relation to a permanent solution of the European situation."

The Reverend Thomas J. Shields, president of Loyola University: "The editorial 'America's Great Opportunity,' was very appropriate and very fine. After all, the human race is really one race, so why do we have to be so utterly separate and apart from each other, always fighting and quarreling?"

Archbishop Joseph Francis Rummell: "Undoubtedly the plan outlined in the Item editorial, on the formation of a United States of Europe, represents very progressive thinking and an idealism that is worthy of serious consideration.

"However, it is hardly fair to compare the merging of the Thirteen Colonies into the United States of America with the merging of the European nations into one united nation. In the first, there was uniformity of origin and language, for most of the colonists were of English origin.

"Also, there was a common ambition—namely, to be separated from the domination of the mother country and to breathe the air of freedom in a new atmosphere.

"In Europe there are centuries of tradition, with differences of nationality, language, custom and rivalries, all of which are still evident even in the midst of the modern crisis. Nevertheless, the ideal must some time be attempted, notwithstanding the evident difficulties.

"It is significant that 150 years have elapsed since Washington expressed the idea of a United States of Europe on the American pattern and 100 years have passed since Victor Hugo gave expression to the same idea; and yet, there has not been even an approach to such a unification.

"However, we must not despair. Certainly a United States of Europe is worth a trial and may prove the alternative of quarreling, rivalries and possibly new wars with which we are confronted, notwithstanding all the sacrifice and punishment of the recent World Wars.

"Let us hope that idealism will prevail once again, as it did in the formation of the United States of America."

Walter Williams, radio commentator: "I think America's Great Opportunity was one of the finest editorials I have ever had the pleasure of reading.

"I am enthusiastic about the plan advocated, which looks to me like the most practical solution yet offered for the problems of Europe.

"Such a federation of European nations could well save American lives and dollars. I am wholeheartedly in favor of it."

Ben J. Williams, cotton exporter: "In my opinion your editorial was outstandingly forceful, logical, and timely.

"You have pointed out the only course to be followed if world chaos is to be avoided and an enduring peace secured.

"I hope your contribution to the cause of sound thought, offered now while there is less freedom from fear and from want than ever, will receive world-wide attention.

"I suggest it be sent with the editor's personal letter of transmittal to a large number of important individuals in circles where our destiny is up for decision."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 24, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

475. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved

March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

476. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the setting aside of convictions of Federal offenders who have been placed on probation and have fully complied with the conditions of their probation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

477. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the payment of the sum of \$92 to Carl W. Sundstrom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

478. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the report of the Library of Congress Planning Committee, dated March 12, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

479. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service," approved November 21, 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

480. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of United States Housing Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 178); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

481. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 amounting to a decrease of \$3,434,200 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 179); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

482. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of \$2,065.51 for the Securities and Exchange Commission (H. Doc. No. 180); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

483. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$50,000 for the Smithsonian Institution (H. Doc. No. 181); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

484. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report prepared by the American Red Cross reflecting all foreign war relief operations which have been conducted since July 1, 1940; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEEFE: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2700. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 154. Joint resolution making an appropriation for expenses incident to the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest; without amendment (Rept. No. 179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service submits a supplement-

tal report on H. R. 1350, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes" (Rept. No. 44, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Foreign Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1000) creating a commission to examine and render final decisions on all claims by American nationals who were members of the armed forces of the United States and who were prisoners of war of Germany, Italy, or Japan, for payment of its awards, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 2700. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2701. A bill to amend the Carey Act with respect to leasing, for grazing or for oil or gas development, unsettled and unclaimed portions of land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2702. A bill to permit members of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain benefits of relief and retirement to receive credit for honorable military or naval service; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2703. A bill to enable veterans who are civil-service employees to take advantage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2704. A bill to amend chapter 29 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER:

H. R. 2705. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Fort Ontario Military Reservation, N. Y., to the State of New York; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2706. A bill to require the Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration to execute and deliver to present owners of real property quitclaim deeds to the interest in the minerals in or under such property reserved by the United States pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act in those cases in which such interest has only a nominal value; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 2707. A bill to provide direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of \$65 per month to needy citizens 55 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2708. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 2709. A bill to amend section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2710. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2711. A bill to provide that the Legislative Reference Service shall compile and make available the voting records of the Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2712. A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act may be filed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2713. A bill to encourage employment of veterans with pensionable or compensable service-connected disabilities through Federal reimbursement to any employer, insurer, or fund, of amounts of workmen's compensation paid on account of disability or death arising out of such employment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2714. A bill to provide for a statutory award of \$10 per month to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2715. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2716. A bill to provide increases of compensation for veterans of World War I and World War II with service-connected disabilities, who have dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 2717. A bill to amend section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of salt, for table use, not having a required content of iodides; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 2718. A bill to amend section 811 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the inclusion in the gross estate for the purposes of the estate tax of certain transfers taking effect at death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2719. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2720. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of governmental employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 2721. A bill to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 2722. A bill to eliminate the requirement that a veteran pursuing a course of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 must satisfy the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as to his reasons for making a change in such course; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 2723. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2724. A bill to provide for recognition of the State of Florida as a community-property State for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 2725. A bill creating a Commission on Federal Contributions to States and Local Governments by reason of Federal ownership of real property; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2726. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution favoring the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 541, Seventy-ninth Congress; House Report No. 1205, Seventy-ninth Congress; and House Report No. 2729, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. Res. 159. Resolution making H. R. 246 a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make national service life insurance available to all Pacific island veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation barring all forms of liquor advertising from interstate mails, from radio and motion-picture programs; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 2727. A bill for the relief of Illinois Packing Co., of Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 2728. A bill for the relief of Darwin Slump; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2729. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2730. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Curry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2731. A bill for the relief of Gustave A. Lohse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOBLECK:

H. R. 2732. A bill for the relief of Dennis Stanton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 2733. A bill for the relief of Andrew W. Peterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIBBOTT:

H. R. 2734. A bill for the relief of Joseph M. Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

238. By Mr. KEATING: Petition protesting against the discontinuance of rent control and urging the continuance of sugar control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

239. By Mr. SCRIVNER: Petition of citizens of Redfield, Kans., urging support for legislation to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising, and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

240. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolutions adopted by the Sheet Metal Contractors National Association board of directors meeting held recently, requesting removal of all priorities and directives that are holding back the peacetime production of necessary material for construction of all kinds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

241. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Petition of a number of veterans from Cambria County, Pa.: (1) To permit immediate cash payments for unused leave, (2) to provide for increased subsistence payments under the GI bill of rights, (3) to lift the on-the-job wage ceilings; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of hosts, Thou who art concerned about two billions of Thy creatures all over the earth, and yet who art as concerned about each of us here as if we were an only child, Thou dost understand how hard it is for these Thy servants to keep in mind the millions of their fellow citizens for whom they must legislate. Thou knowest the clamor of voices in their ears, the constant tugging at their sleeves, forever trying to influence them; the small voices of the little men without money or names; the blatant voices of aggressive pressure groups; the big voices of selfish men and those working for personal gain, even the whispering inner voices of personal ambition, those insinuating voices holding out the lure of unmerited reward. Amid all the din of voices, give these Thy servants the willingness to take time to listen to Thy voice, knowing that if they follow the still small voice within, all Thy people will be served fairly, and all groups will get what they deserve. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1947.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.
A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KNOWLAND thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 21, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution making an appropriation for expenses incident to the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 27) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. President, indicating the reason for the letter which was read a moment ago from the desk, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to continue to sit this afternoon in its hearings in respect to the Greek-Turkish loan.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FINAL REPORT OF AMERICAN RED CROSS RELATING TO FOREIGN WAR RELIEF OPERATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 21, 1947.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE PRO TEMPORE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the final report prepared by the American Red Cross reflecting all foreign war relief operations which have been conducted since July 1, 1940, from appropriations for foreign war relief.

The Congress originally made available \$85,000,000 for assistance to war-stricken persons throughout the world. Subsequent legislation consolidated and extended the availability of all funds until June 30, 1945. The Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945, continued \$2,150,000 available until December 31, 1945, in order to provide for the termination of the program.

There is also transmitted herewith a statement of allocations made to Government purchasing agencies from this appropriation together with balances remaining unobligated in each allocation.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated: